

# House of Representatives

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.  
Rev. Father John F. Lincoln, St. Vincent de Paul Parish, South Boston, Mass., offered the following prayer:  
In the name of the Father and of the Son and the Holy Spirit. Amen.

We beseech Thee, Almighty God, to look favorably upon our beloved Speaker of the House, Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK, and all the Members of this great legislative body, and direct, we beseech Thee, Almighty God, all their actions by Thy holy inspiration.

We beg of You to pour forth upon Your humble servants—the Representatives of the United States of America—the light of Your own divine wisdom—to know thoroughly, understand completely, and perform faithfully the duties and responsibilities entrusted by divine providence.

May Thy divine love, manifested by our very presence, inspire each and every lawmaker to seek only that which is good and just and unselfish.

May their every prayer, every law and action, by Thy gracious help and assistance, always begin with Thee and through Thee be happily ended, you who live and reign forever and ever. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Vice President, pursuant to section 5, Public Law 87-758, had appointed Mr. PROUTY as a member of the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium Advisory Board.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 207, 81st Congress, had appointed Mr. DODD as a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 1028, 84th Congress, had appointed Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. McGEE, and Mr. PEARSON as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 372, 84th Congress, had appointed Mr. MCCARTHY as a member of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 87-759, had appointed Mr. BASS as a member of the Battle of New

Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 1028, 84th Congress, had appointed Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. BOGGS as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy.

## REPORT OF THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, section 5(b)(3) of the Employment Act of 1946, as amended, requires that the Joint Economic Committee file its report on the President's economic report by March 1. This year the Congress passed Senate Joint Resolution 3, extending the date of transmission of the President's 1965 economic report from January 20 to January 28. Because of this late filing of the economic report our committee was not able to hold hearings and prepare its own report in time to meet the deadline of March 1.

I ask unanimous consent that the Joint Economic Committee be permitted to file its report on March 17, instead of March 1.

This has been approved by the minority members of the Joint Economic Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from Texas say again what he said concerning the attitude of Mr. CURTIS?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. It was taken up before the whole committee this morning and Senator JAVITS approved it and Mr. CURTIS approved it as well as all of the members of the committee approving it. It is absolutely necessary and unavoidable. We cannot help it. We just cannot file it by Monday, because our hearings were not finished until Saturday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The net effect of what the gentleman is requesting is what, then?

Mr. PATMAN. It is to extend the time of filing the report under the law from March 1 to March 17.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And that date, March 17, has been agreed to by the minority members of the committee?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. By the minority as well as the majority members of the committee.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

## IMMIGRATION HEARINGS

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, hearings on immigration legislation by the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality will commence on Wednesday, March 3, at 10 a.m. These hearings were originally scheduled to open on February 16, but were delayed because of hearings on Presidential inability before the full Judiciary Committee.

Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach has been invited to appear as the first witness. He will be followed by other witnesses representing the interested and concerned departments and agencies of the Government.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of last week I was absent from the House of Representatives attending business in my district relative to the closing of Truax Air Force Base. As a result of this absence, I was not recorded on three House votes taken during Wednesday and Thursday, February 17 and 18. Mr. Speaker, had I been here I would have voted in the affirmative on rollcall No. 16 to extend the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; in the negative on rollcall No. 19 on the motion to recommend the bill (H.R. 45) relating to the Inter-American Development Bank, and in the affirmative on the subsequent rollcall No. 20 on final passage of the same measure.

## TESTIMONY OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ON SOUTHEAST ASIA

(Mr. ICHORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, as a followup of the discussion yesterday on South Vietnam I think it would be very appropriate to insert in the Record an unclassified version of the testimony of Secretary McNamara which was made available to the committee, and which was made before the Committee on Armed Services on May 25, 1964.

Mr. Speaker, this concise and very explicit statement does a magnificent job of summing up the importance to the free world of the United States carrying out its announced objectives in South Vietnam, as well as why the President and the Department of Defense must have the complete support of the people of the

Pagan, John P.	Rankin, William	Saracino, Lynn E.	Stewart, Joseph D.	Varrell, Thomas A.	Wilkins, James R.
Pankey, Paul A.	Ranta, Berton M.	Saum, Robert W.	Stewart, Raymond A., Jr.	Vernon, Laurens M.	Williams, Charles G., Jr.
Partin, Richard A.	Rapuanio, John J., Jr.	Schensiol, John L.	Stiemke, Dean A.	Vetter, Lawrence C., Jr.	Williams, Clarence D.
Patak, Lowell W.	Rauwald, Thomas C.	Schiller, Paul J.	Stolz, Frank C.	Vogel, Lyman W., Jr.	Willson, Gordon R.
Paul, Charles H.	Raymond, Herbert D., III	Schmitt, Harvey T.	Stoughton, David H.	Vollendorf, James A.	Willshin, David B.
Pearson, James W.		Schmitt, James H.	Strong, David E.	Walke, Alfred J.	Wirsching, Robin F.
Pentz, Everett W.	Reed, Don T.	Schwartz, Donald M.	Tatlock, Alan R.	Walker, James R.	Wood, Laurice E., Jr.
Perkins, Dennis N. T.	Regan, Richard J.	Schwartz, Timothy P.	Teall, Robert R.	Walker, Larry D.	Wood, Mansel M.
Perso, James C.	Rehrauer, Mark A.	Shabosky, Ronald J.	Thompson, Jack C.	Wallick, Dwight A.	Wood, William M.
Peters, William J.	Reynolds, Clarence O., Jr.	Shambaugh, Dale K.	Thompson, James R.	Ward, Joel D.	Woods, Erik C.
Pickersgill, Douglas W.	Rick, Kevin G.	Shoff, James R.	Timberg, Robert R.	Weber, John D.	Woodriddle, Larry A.
Pinney, Charles A., III	Rick, Ronald A.	Singer, John D., III	Tinsley, William A., III	Weeks, Larry L.	Wright, Joseph D.
Pistelli, Ido E.	Robinson, Larry L.	Snell, Charles S.	Tschan, Robert E.	Wegge, James A.	Wright, William E., Jr.
Polyascko, Gerald J.	Roe, Frederick S.	Snyder, Ray G.	Tucker, Phillip E.	Welch, Bruce E.	Yoshida, Hubert M.
Price, Lawrence A.	Roser, Herbert G.	Springer, Robert C.	Van Houten, Robert A., Jr.	Welch, Jerome A.	Zavacki, Francis
Prout, Patrick M.	Rowe, John H.	Squires, Robert J.	Vankat, William J.	Westling, William K.	Zey, Richard B.
Fuskar, Robert J.	Russell, David R.	Steele, Thomas W.	Van Riper, James K.	White, Richard T.	Zimmermann, Jack B.
Bamsdell, Jeffrey K.	Russell, Glenn W., Jr.	Stern, George E., Jr.	Van Riper, Paul K.	Whitehouse, John J.	
	Russell, Glenn W., Jr.	Stevens, John L., III			
	Saarela, David E.	Stevens, John M.			

No. 37—14

United States in their efforts to stop Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

I commend this statement to the attention of the Members.

UNCLASSIFIED VERSION OF TESTIMONY OF SECRETARY McNAMARA BEFORE THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE ON MAY 25, 1964, ON SOUTHEAST ASIA

The independence of southeast Asia is not only important in itself but has great significance for maintenance of favorable U.S. relationships throughout the Far East and even beyond. If Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia lost their independence, direct Communist pressure could be brought to bear on Thailand. It and other nations in southeast Asia would have great difficulty in maintaining their independence unaided. Eventually, Korea and the offshore nations—Indonesia, the Philippines, Japan—would feel the pressure to accommodate themselves in various ways to closer Communist pressure. Other countries, such as Australia, New Zealand, India, Pakistan, and even Iran would be more exposed to the Communist threat. And the results of such expansion could someday affect the attitudes of our Western European Allies. In short, the relationships we now have with all these countries would be modified fundamentally and distinctly to the disadvantage of the security of the United States if southeast Asia fell to the Communists.

#### TAX CREDIT FOR COSTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to provide a tax credit to individuals for the costs of higher education. And I want to call attention to this general kind of approach to Government assistance. Instead of making our Government into a kind of funnel through which the taxpayer's money is collected, sent to Washington, and then dispensed back to individuals in the form of aid accompanied by controls, this approach emphasizes the need to let individuals keep more of their own money. This way they can better meet their own needs and do it according to their own judgment and conscience.

This bill is distinct from those proposing deductions from an individual's taxable income. My bill provides that when an individual computes his income tax and arrives at the amount due he subtracts from that amount with certain limitations, funds he has spent for higher education for himself or another person. He pays that much less as his income tax.

The amount of the credit would be limited to 75 percent of the first \$200, 25 percent of the next \$300, and 10 percent of the next \$1,000, spent for tuition fees, books, and supplies for a student at an institution of higher education. The maximum credit is \$325.

This seems to me a thoroughly healthy way to provide educational assistance to a taxpayer and his dependents. First, it is an efficient way, because each dollar is utilized directly.

Second, this is aid without regard to the controversy surrounding public versus private education. The individual

uses the benefit as he himself sees fit, apart from any involvement with the Government.

Third, it would relieve the pressure on scholarship funds. As individuals become more able to provide for their own educational expenses, the limited funds available for scholarships could then be directed to those most deserving and most in need of outside financial assistance for education.

Fourth, our educational system, operating independent of Government, is a national asset which surely ought to be encouraged. This approach provides that encouragement.

I join with others of both political parties who support this approach to higher education assistance in asking that it receive early committee consideration so that we can move ahead toward enactment of this needed and thoroughly justified legislation.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 22]

Belcher	Hall	Morse
Boggs	Halleck	Multer
Bow	Hanna	Murray
Burton, Utah	Hays	Nix
Byrne, Pa.	Hollifield	O'Brien
Byrnes, Wis.	Holland	Powell
Celler	Irwin	Reid, N.Y.
Dawson	Jones, Mo.	Schneebeil
Diggs	Karsten	Smith, N.Y.
Duncan, Oreg.	Kelly	Sullivan
Everett	Keogh	Taylor
Farnsley	King, Calif.	Thompson, Tex.
Fulton, Tenn.	Macdonald	Toll
Goodell	Machen	White, Idaho
Green, Oreg.	Maillard	Widnall
Gurney	Martin, Mass.	Wilson
Hagen, Calif.	Miller	Charles H.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 379 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### TO PROVIDE FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATION AND STUDY AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 68, BY THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 69) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 69

*Resolved*, That effective January 3, 1965, the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by H. Res. 68 of the Eighty-ninth Congress incurred by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$150,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assist-

ance, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all meetings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

Sec. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

With the following committee amendments:

On lines 1 and 2, strike out "January 4, 1964" and insert "January 3, 1965".

On line 5, strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$75,000".

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 84

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 149) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 149

*Resolved*, That, effective January 3, 1965, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations, authorized by H. Res. 84, Eighty-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$118,250, including expenditures for the employment of experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditures in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 188) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 188

*Resolved*, That, effective January 3, 1965, expenses of conducting the investigations au-

thorized by section 18 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$380,000, including expenditures for employment of experts, special counsel, investigators, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. That the official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

Sec. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, strike out "\$380,000" and insert "\$370,000".

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I understand that this resolution will probably not receive unanimous support. For that reason may I simply mention that the funds request of the Committee on Un-American Activities was reduced by \$10,000. They will have approximately the same amount that was appropriated last year. Actually, when we consider the fact that there was an automatic pay increase for employees, amounting to something over \$20,000, it means that the amount is a little less than it was in the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I understand there are several Members who want to make some remarks on this subject. I am going to yield at this time 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS].

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to explain to my colleagues what we expect the procedure will be today.

There will be a debate lasting not more than 1 hour. At the termination of the debate there will be a motion to recommit this bill to the House Administration Committee, with instructions to hold public hearings on the subject of the budget for the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Public hearings were suggested by the distinguished gentleman and legal scholar from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS]. I would like to make it clear that Mr. CURTIS does not oppose the House Un-American Activities Committee. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 8, 1965, Mr. CURTIS addressed the House as follows:

I think it would be helpful if the House Administration Committee would hold public hearings at the time the budget of the House Un-American Activities Committee is under consideration and invite the critics of the House Un-American Activities Commit-

tee to be heard in full. If the critics have a case that can be made, let us have it presented under circumstances which permit cross-examination of the witnesses who level the charges and testimony in rebuttal to be presented by those who disagree with them. The Congress of the United States is the proper forum in which to present the pros and cons of controversial positions of a political nature. The Congress constantly fulfills this function through public hearings by its standing committees. Utilizing the Congress in this fashion is the best way to resolve matters where grave differences of opinion exist on subjects of a political nature, such as this one.

I commend the gentleman from Missouri and support his recommendations for examining this vexing situation in a proper manner. To that end and in the course of this debate today, I will offer this motion to recommit with instructions to the House Administration Committee to hold open hearings.

A vote in favor of the motion to recommit, let me emphasize, is a vote enabling this House to get proper information on which to base a decision. I urge my colleagues to vote for the motion to recommit and, in the event it fails, to vote against the appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, I think it appropriate for me to try to analyze why we are faced with this problem today, why there are some of us Members who feel that we have no choice but to oppose this resolution of appropriation for the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and why we are supported by great numbers of patriotic Americans, by distinguished lawyers, professors, scholars, by world-respected newspapers and eminent religious leaders.

Our objections are fundamental. They are constitutional. They are not assuaged in the least by recent announcements that the committee now contemplates inquiry into the activities of the Ku Klux Klan, the Minutemen, the Black Muslims, or any other group that may be described as a part of the radical right. The same constitutional disabilities exist regardless of the political philosophy of the committee's targets.

The rub is that the House Committee on Un-American Activities never should have been created by this body as a standing committee. Let me review with you for a moment what happened here in this very Chamber.

When the 79th Congress convened on January 3, 1945, the mandate of the Dies committee, predecessor to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, had expired. It had been established as a temporary investigative committee and would have needed new authorization and appropriation in the Congress just convened. Congressman Sabbath offered the usual resolution to the effect that the rules of the 79th Congress be the same as those of the 78th Congress but at that moment Congressman John Rankin, of Mississippi, offered an amendment to make the House Committee on Un-American Activities a permanent standing committee. A spirited debate followed and the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], now our distinguished Speaker, protested the Rankin amendment as follows:

I do not know when in the history of our country the National House of Representatives has ever provided by rule for a permanent investigative committee. Mark what we are doing. This is not a question of establishing an investigating committee to investigate conditions that arise from time to time; it is a question of amending the rules of the House to provide for a permanent standing committee that does not consider legislation, but has one subject, one field, the field of investigating and making a report. There is a big difference between establishing a standing committee to investigate and establishing a special investigating committee for a particular Congress. If this amendment is adopted, as far as I know, it will be the first time in the history of this body that a committee of this kind was ever established as a permanent or standing committee.

After further debate the previous question was ordered and a division demanded. The resolution lost by a vote of 134 to 146, Congressman Rankin asked for the yeas and nays. The Rankin amendment prevailed by a vote of 208 to 186 thus establishing the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a standing committee. It is significant to note, however, that those voting in the negative included the majority leader, Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. Francis Walter, of Pennsylvania, later to become the committee's chairman, and the following other distinguished Members of the House: Messrs. CANNON, HOLIFIELD, Kefauver, KEOGH, KING, KIRWAN, MADDEN, MANSFIELD, MILLER of California, MONROE, PATMAN, POAGE, PRICE of Illinois, Sheppard, SPARKMAN, THOMAS of Texas, and Vinson.

So Mr. Speaker, the mistake was made by this House against the advice of the majority leader, against the advice of Representative Francis Walter and Clyde Doyle, both of whom voted against the Rankin amendment. Except for the vote on the committee's appropriation in May 1946, where 81 Members voted against the committee, the Committee on House Un-American Activities has had no great difficulty in remaining a standing committee. That is the way of life in this great legislative body. A standing committee once established is immensely difficult to get rid of, even though its mandate is probably unconstitutional and its behavior embarrassing and belittling to the Congress.

I have no doubt that the U.S. Supreme Court will ultimately find the resolution establishing the House Committee on Un-American Activities in violation of the Constitution. In the *Watkins* case—354 U.S. 178, 1957—the Court by a 6-to-1 decision defined the limits of the congressional power to conduct investigations:

The power is broad. It encompasses inquires concerning the administration of existing laws as well as proposed or possibly needed statutes. It includes surveys of defects in our social, economic, or political system for the purposes of enabling the Congress to remedy them. It comprehends probes into departments of the Federal Government to expose corruption, inefficiency, or waste. But broad as is this power of inquiry, it is not unlimited. There is no general authority to expose the private affairs of individuals without justification in terms of the functions of the Congress.



to Wilmington from New York City in October of 1956 to organize the senior center. She had been director of the Yorkville Neighborhood Club in New York, a similar organization for older people, and has worked in YMCA and YWCA programs for many years.

"Our aim is to make people realize that life has not stopped," explains Mrs. Patterson. "They used to go to work each day, now they come here to find creative activity and stimulating experiences."

Creative activity includes everything from daily dances to classes in crafts, enameling, weaving, music and discussion groups. Stimulating experiences might include meeting new friends, the daily fellowship of lunch and games with old friends, learning new skills and helping others. All are a part of the senior center's program.

A typical day for Mrs. Patterson and her senior citizens might include a discussion group in the morning on the problems of the older person, led by State Senator Louise Conner, lunch at 12:15, dancing from 1 p.m. "until we're tired," and classes.

The looms, kilns, painting equipment and other materials available fill multiple purposes, Mrs. Patterson feels.

"Doctors frequently refer arthritic or stroke patients to us," she explains. "The activity involved, and the joy of creating, often make a person forget his pain while it is being helped. A great deal of physical rehabilitation goes on at this 'recreation' center. Nearly half of our people live alone; this gives them a place where they can have fun with people of their own age and interests."

"We are also involved in community service projects, such as mailing and stuffing envelopes. We work with the Red Cross, the American Cancer Society, and many others. Each Wednesday 50 to 60 people meet here to fill workers kits for door-to-door canvassing."

"And it's important to feel needed and useful—our rhythm band regularly puts on programs for other older persons' groups in the area. One lady, 94 years old, plays one of our eight harmonicas."

"We are open to anyone 60 years old or over. One man, 90, goes bowling three times a week—we recently celebrated his birthday with a bowling party. A visiting group calls and visits our sick members."

On the need for and the role of women in community service, Mrs. Patterson says, "If one has had a varied background, experience, training, it's a shame to waste this on staying home and minding the knitting. We all need goals in life; if you don't live up to your resources and talents and experiences, you are not carrying your share in your community or country."

see an independent and unbiased analysis of this proposal and a comparison of its features with those contained in H.R. 1, the King-Anderson bill.

I have just read such a comparison, and I should like to call it to the attention of my colleagues. It is an article appearing in the March issue of Consumer Reports, a respected journal published by the Consumers Union of Mount Vernon, N.Y. Without objection, the article follows:

#### MEDICARE VERSUS THE AMA'S LATEST SUBSTITUTE

After two decades of effort, 1965 appears to be the year for medicare—a federally administered national hospital insurance plan, financed through social security contributions for persons over 65. This time the administration's medicare bill seems assured of passage. As usual, though, the American Medical Association has proposed a last-gasp substitute. A comparison of the two proposals is instructive.

The medicare bill may of course be altered in the legislative process, but its four basic provisions are not likely to be changed significantly. They can be outlined briefly. For those over 65, medicare would:

Pay the full costs of up to 60 days of hospitalization (in ward or semiprivate accommodations), minus a first-day deductible, for each benefit period (which begins on the first day of hospitalization and ends whenever the patient has accumulated 90 days out of the hospital within a period of 180 days).

Provide for an additional 60 days of post-hospital care for each illness in a convalescent or rehabilitation center operating under an agreement with a hospital (not an ordinary, custodial-care nursing home).

Pay for up to 240 home nursing visits a year under medical supervision, in programs organized by nonprofit voluntary or public agencies.

Provide payment for hospital outpatient diagnostic services and tests, minus a deductible that would exclude routine low-cost laboratory or other diagnostic procedures.

These provisions would be financed by an increase in the social security withholding tax. Ultimately, a citizen would contribute (to a special, separate health care trust fund within the social security system) 0.45 percent of his earnings up to \$5,600, and his employer would contribute an equal amount. Special provision would be made for those now over 65 who are not covered by social security through the Government's general fund.

The medicare program gives the citizen free choice of physician and hospital. It does not pay the costs of doctor bills, out-of-hospital drugs, prolonged or catastrophic illness requiring long, continuous hospitalization, or extended custodial care in nursing homes.

CU's medical consultants believe that this is, by and large, a sound basic package. The 60-day provision would encompass all but about 5 percent of the usual hospital stays of older persons, and the extended-care proposal would both relieve the pressure on general hospital beds and spur the construction of badly needed convalescent and rehabilitation facilities in many communities. Services of this kind are essential in many illnesses following their acute stage and prior to the time a patient can return to his home or transfer (if necessary) to a custodial institution.

The provision for organized home nursing service has obvious value: such services often preclude the need for hospitalization and permit earlier discharge from hospital or convalescent center. Outpatient diagnostic services also are capable of averting many costly hospitalizations by encouraging the early

detection and treatment of disease—at a time when it may be cured or controlled by relatively simple short-term procedures.

Since the heaviest health cost of the elderly is hospitalization, the medicare coverage could make it financially possible for the first time for many citizens to purchase voluntary insurance (of the Blue Shield type) to cover physicians' bills and other supplementary costs.

The AMA substitute for medicare at first glance seems invitingly comprehensive. (It is, in fact, a resurrection of proposals made during the Eisenhower administration that the AMA bitterly opposed at the time, and again just a few months ago at its house of delegates meeting. The AMA now refers to its new proposal as a redefinition of policy.) The AMA substitute simply proposes the use of State and Federal funds to buy Blue Cross-Blue Shield or commercial health insurance for indigent persons over 65—it does not say how the funds would be raised, in the absence of a social security tax.

The proposal does say, however, that a means test would be required to determine the eligible poor, with the States using State and Federal money to pay all, some, or none of the insurance premium cost, depending on the citizen's qualification under the means test. Means tests are—moral consideration aside—enormously expensive and difficult to administer. Furthermore, the program would be administered by the States, raising the possibility that there would be 50 different kinds of governmental machinery, eligibility standard, and payment procedures. (Under some State rules setting eligibility for help under the current Kerr-Mills law, ownership of property or even ability of one's children to pay can make an old person ineligible.)

The subsidized insurance would pay for physicians' and surgeons' bills and drug costs as well as hospital bills, and an AMA statement asserts that this would be "comprehensive health care" and not "limited to hospital and nursing home care representing only a fraction of the cost of sickness." As CU has pointed out, however, this "fraction" covers the heaviest, the most financially crippling share of the burden. Furthermore, since the AMA has not spelled out specifically what the private insurance would cover (and in existing voluntary insurance policies, cash benefits, days of coverage, and other provisions vary widely from plan to plan and from area to area), it is difficult to tell how comprehensive the protection of the AMA's proposal would be.

The current medicare proposal, obviously, will not solve every aspect of the Nation's health problems, even for those over 65. It does not and cannot guarantee good medical care to its beneficiaries, and it pays relatively little attention to the quality of the services it pays for (though the bill does contain a provision for periodic review, by the medical staffs of participating hospitals, of the necessity for hospitalization, length of stay, and other such features). However, it is a significant beginning.

#### Medicare Versus the AMA's Latest Substitute

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. MORRIS K. UDALL**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the American Medical Association has recently circulated to all of our offices letters and literature about its new proposal called eldercare. The proposal purports to offer the elderly people of this country "comprehensive health care." I am sure many of my colleagues have wanted to

#### The War in Vietnam—I

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, early this month Mr. Lucian C. Warren, chief of the Washington Bureau of the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., arrived in

Saigon to participate in a 10-day tour of Vietnam to observe conditions there. He was officially invited by the Department of Defense to make this observation and to report conditions as he saw them. His report, which is in several parts, reflects his own uncensored views, and there were no restrictions with respect to the copy he sent to his paper.

Mr. Warren made several trips into the war zones and participated in a number of Air Force and Army combat missions. He was briefed by the U.S. Embassy, the U.S. Information Service, and the U.S. Military Assistance Command in South Vietnam. In addition, Mr. Warren had the opportunity to talk with rank and file soldiers both of the South Vietnam forces and American military forces in the combat zones. He also talked to civilian and military officials of the South Vietnamese Government, as well as natives in various sections of the country.

Mr. Warren is an outstanding reporter in our Nation's Capital for the past 20 years and a former president of the National Press Club. I commend his on-the-spot report of conditions in Vietnam to the attention of my colleagues.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the first of this series which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express on February 21, 1965:

THE WAR IN VIETNAM—SAIGON PRESENTS TWO  
FACES

(By Lucian C. Warren)

(Lucian C. Warren, who has reported the Washington scene with distinction for the Courier-Express for many years, has gone to South Vietnam to have a look at that war-torn land with his reporter's perceptive eye. This is the first of a series of stories on his experiences and observations. It describes his arrival in Saigon and his first day in that uneasy city.)

SAIGON.—"Pan American welcomes you to Saigon," proclaims a picturesque leaflet distributed to disembarking passengers just before arrival at the capital of South Vietnam.

The cover page shows two well-dressed American couples smiling happily as if they arrived for a vacation at the Riviera. Inside, after telling passengers how to get through customs and immigration stations, the pamphlet suggests that the city of Saigon "offers much to the pleasure seeker," with "fine wines, cognac and choice meals served at excellent restaurants and nightclubs throughout the city."

For awhile after arrival, a Saigon visitor might be fooled into thinking that Pan Am's idyllic message still rang true. The 20-minute ride from the airport into downtown Saigon at noontime offered initial supporting evidence.

#### CHILDREN PLAYING

Many children with schoolbooks were in evidence, some engaged happily in the Saigon version of tag.

The streets abounded with beautiful Vietnamese women, attired in spotlessly laundered oriental garments.

A noontime traffic jam, the prelude to a 3-hour siesta during the hottest period of the day, features hundreds of taxis, both of the motored and rickshaw variety, in a mad game of chicken. The idea seemed to be to come as close as possible to hitting another vehicle or pedestrian without actually doing so.

Certainly the Caravelle Hotel, at which this correspondent registered, was elegant enough with fancy draperies, polished brass fixtures, automatic elevators and air conditioning throughout.

#### CONTRAST

But it didn't take long for disillusionment to set in, and the drab and ugly aspects of a tropical oriental city engaged in one of the world's nastiest wars became clearly manifest.

A U.S. colonel entrusted with newsmen chaperoning duties, saw to it that immediately after the siesta the newly arrived reporters were shepherded to the local Pan American ticket office to get reservations for departure about 10 days hence. He said he had seen too many get caught without plane accommodations home to take a chance.

#### VENDORS

Along the street, one sidewalk vendor offered to sell "feisty" pictures. We were warned to have on truck with such vendors of others of the moneychanging variety. Seems that these sidewalk entrepreneurs will offer a fantastic exchange rate for American dollars—something in the neighborhood of 140 Vietnamese piasters to the dollar, when the official rate is 70 to the dollar.

The gimmick is that these sleight-of-hand artists will punctiliously count out the 140 piasters, then vanish quickly before the victim discovers he is many piasters short. We were warned also that the pickpockets are more numerous than in Times Square and that the slightest jostle might mean that your wallet was being lifted.

#### PARLIAMENT BUILDING

On our way to filing the necessary application for accreditation, we passed a large and ornate building.

"That's where Parliament meets \* \* \* when it meets," our escort remarked. But of course the Parliament hasn't met for many weeks as one military coup succeeded another in the Vietnamese Government game of musical chairs for the leaders. The only thing uniform about the coups was that Parliament stayed dissolved. Indeed, the Hall of Parliament was advertising orchestra concerts and other engagements as one way to collect a few rentals during the long and perhaps permanent parliamentary hiatus.

At the Vietnamese accreditation office for newsmen, a young Vietnamese woman took our applications and issued our accreditation cards with brisk precision.

"A clever girl," our guide volunteered. "She has lasted through four administrations."

#### BARBED WIRE

Soon after, we became official American war correspondents by being accredited at the U.S. Information Service headquarters.

A tangle of barbed wire in front was a sharp reminder that USIS not only had to worry about Vietcong saboteurs, but needs protection also from the rioting South Vietnam non-Communists when they might become displeased at the U.S. attitude toward the latest cynical coup d'etat.

A 5 p.m. press briefing for some 150 war correspondents, a daily ritual here, was almost totally concerned with the mad scramble to get U.S. dependents evacuated in a 10-day period.

#### KHANH SEES PRESS

Two hours later Lt. Gen. Nguyen Khanh, South Vietnam's current military strongman, held his own press conference to announce that 24 South Vietnamese planes had successfully bombed military installations in North Vietnam with the help of a "cover" of U.S. fighter planes.

As he spoke, the rumble of firing could be heard, possibly as much as 10 to 20 miles away.

"They're probably lobbing shells at the Vietcong, who usually begin their military activity at dusk," someone explained.

#### BOMBING SCENE

As we bedded down later at the Caravelle Hotel, after first killing what looked like a

giant cockroach and brushing our teeth with bottled water (tapwater might produce dysentery), we reflected that only 5 months ago a Vietcong bomb went off in the fifth floor of our hostelry.

Life certainly is not dull in Saigon.

#### Uncle Sam Is a Salesman

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include excerpts from an article by Ralph McGill, appearing in the Atlanta Constitution of February 13, 1965, pointing out the progress that our country is making in world trade and the great contribution made by former Secretary of Commerce, Luther Hodges, in increasing export sales.

#### UNCLE SAM AS A SALESMAN

Uncle Sam has become a go-getting salesman. He is, in fact, doing better than ever in history. He was, of course, obliged to do so. But the important fact is that he has not failed.

After the Second World War ended conditions new and strange were imposed on the economy and understanding of the United States. These have changed with the years.

There now is a prosperous Europe—instead of a bankrupt one as in 1945. NATO, a paramount necessity in the years after war's end, is in need of revision.

The treaties made by the late John Foster Dulles with Eastern countries were never very meaningful. They are less so today.

The story goes on and on—the need for revision of organizations and attitudes is great.

Increasingly, since about 1947, the balance-of-payments problem has become more and more acute. One way we can improve it is to sell more abroad.

Little attention was paid this important aspect of the U.S. economy until President Kennedy ordered it. In 1961 the then Secretary of Commerce, Luther Hodges, a former able Governor of North Carolina, was asked to set in motion a plan to increase trade.

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Based on accomplishments, the program begun in 1961 proved to be sensational. An itemized account emphasized the impressive facts of it.

1. Since the inception of the program in 1961, exports have increased by 28 percent. They reached a total of \$25 billion in 1964. This was 13 percent above the total of \$22.3 billion in 1963.

2. Our trade surplus, exports over imports, has increased by a whopping 45 percent since 1960. Our surplus is currently at the rate of \$6.8 billion; it is \$1.8 billion, or 30 percent greater than a year ago.

3. Commerce Department and Department of Labor statistics agree that more than 3.4 million American workers are employed, directly or indirectly, in production, transportation, and marketing of the more than \$25 billion worth of goods sold to foreign customers.

4. It is estimated that each additional billion dollars of exports creates about 135,000 jobs.

If we do not engage strongly and competitively in world trade we seriously will weaken ourselves with growing unemploy-

## INQUIRY SHOULD BE BROAD

Many of the matters of possible inquiry would have to consider changes in laws and parliamentary procedures. House Concurrent Resolutions 4 and 20 contain a proviso that the joint committee would not be authorized "to make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedures, practices, and/or precedents of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House." While this language is identical with that in the Monroney bill, Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, I personally do not believe that the study efforts which will be made should be in any manner circumscribed.

The reason for this restraining language, as we all know, is the sensitivity of each House to the constitutional provision that "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings." Of course, any changes in the formal proceedings would be a matter for action separately in each House. I see no bar in constitutional or public policy against recommendations by a joint committee.

Indeed, the very purpose of a joint study effort is to lay the foundation in facts and analyses for each House to be able to judge whether changes in formal proceedings should be made. Therefore, the mandate of the committee should not be limited; and if it is authorized to study, certainly it should be authorized to make recommendations. I would gladly support an amendment to this effect in the resolution.

While I am on the subject of amendments, I note that the resolution does not have any specific time limit for its tenure. Whether or not this implies that the committee would lapse with the end of the Congress authorizing it, it might be useful to specify that the committee tenure would continue through the 89th Congress, with whatever stipulations are appropriate for the presentation of final reports.

Finally, I note that House Concurrent Resolutions 4 and 20 provide for equal representation of both parties on the joint committee. This follows the precedent of the LaFollette-Monroney special committee, which had equal numbers of Republicans and Democrats of both Houses.

Ordinarily, committees reflect the party composition of each House, and some Members may prefer that these ratios be reflected on the proposed joint committee. I recall that when I sponsored a resolution back in 1951 along with Senator HUMPHREY in the Senate, provision was made for more Democrats than Republicans, in accord with party composition of the Houses. However, there are matters in which party differences should have a lesser role. I note that the Senate Committee on Ethical Conduct has equal party representation. This follows the practice of the committee which was established to rule on the conduct of the late Senator Joseph McCarthy.

Certainly party differences need not be a factor in our study of congressional reorganization. I believe that a majority of the Members in both parties favor such an effort, and I am perfectly willing to see that both parties are equally represented on the joint committee. This would be a special joint committee and would expire when its work is done.

Equal bipartisan representation is justified in the same sense that a special committee is justified. Ordinarily, the Committee on Government Operations in each House has jurisdiction over organization matters, including legislative reorganization. While it is proper for the Government Operations Committees to have and exercise such jurisdiction from year to year, we are proposing here a comprehensive one-time review, encompassing both Houses of Congress and all its operation. A special joint committee detached from day to day responsibility and limited in tenure seems more

appropriate for this task, which we similarly commissioned a committee to do 20 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity to appear here and support the resolution for a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

## Vietnam Discussion Needed

## SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply concerned that we develop in the Congress, and among the people of this Nation, a more enlightened discussion of our country's foreign policy—particularly our policy in certain crisis situations such as Vietnam. Without this enlightened discussion, based upon facts rather than pure emotion, this Nation, the Congress, and the administration will be unable to properly develop a reasonable consensus as to our national intent. Consequently, we would be unable to adequately relate our policy and actions throughout the world to that national intent.

Instead, we will tend to merely react to crises in trouble spots around the world—crises created by our enemies in most cases. These reactions may well be inspired by the most laudable of goals—the protection of freedom and democracy, the honoring of commitments to our friends, the maintenance of our national honor—but, because an emotional reaction is never a sound basis for decisionmaking in the complex field of foreign affairs, the actual results may, in fact, reduce our effectiveness in achieving those goals.

The realities of the world today force us to recognize that our country is not all powerful; that our national will cannot prevail in every situation; and that we may even be wrong in our evaluation of what is desired by, or desirable for, the citizens of other countries. Under these circumstances, it is imperative that we realistically evaluate and assign priorities to matters affecting our national interest. We must carefully utilize our national forces and resources to achieve limited and practical goals, and we must be sensitive to the changing political forces in every part of the world.

With this introduction, I want to say that I welcome the increasing popular and Congressional concern on the subject of Vietnam. There are very legitimate, different points of view on this complex issue. They all need to be aired. Personally, I cannot agree with all of our actions in South Vietnam and the policies behind them. I intend to develop my own views on this subject before the public, and the Congress, during the days ahead.

Today, as a beginning, I would like to insert in the RECORD the newsletter which I sent to many of my constituents and to the newspapers of my district on Febru-

ary 15, 1965. I would also like to insert, at this point, the thoughtful column of Walter Lippmann which appeared in the Los Angeles Times of February 21, 1965. I shall follow this with a further elaboration of my views in the days ahead.

The newsletter and column follow:

## WASHINGTON HIGHLIGHTS

(By Congressman GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., 29th Congressional District, California)

Last week in Washington there was some indication that the rapidly deteriorating situation in South Vietnam might finally produce some discussion of U.S. policy among the Members of Congress.

It is clear that the United States is carrying on an undeclared war against North Vietnam. U.S. forces are being used in air strikes against North Vietnamese targets. The pretense that we are merely supplying advisers to a friendly country to aid them in controlling guerrilla insurgents is hardly tenable under present circumstances.

The question for the American public, and for the Congress, to answer is: "When is a war a war?" Without a doubt, if a foreign power was to make an air strike on U.S. territory we would consider it an act of war. U.S. strikes on North Vietnam are quite comparable in magnitude to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, and probably far greater in their relative damage to North Vietnam than was the damage done to the United States at Pearl Harbor. Probably, the North Vietnamese were not taken quite as much by surprise by our attack, as we were by the Japanese attack, but, in other respects, the events are comparable.

If we are at war with a foreign country (and I think we are), then Congress, which under the Constitution is the only body authorized to declare war, is cooperating with the executive branch in a violation of the Constitution. How far must we go in this ridiculous pretense? Is it possible that some day soon this country will find itself engulfed in a nuclear maelstrom, still blithely pretending that we are at peace?

I strongly disagree with this country's action, and lack of policy, in Vietnam. Even more strongly do I object to the squandering of billions of our tax dollars and hundreds of American lives in a situation which may involve us in world war III, without an opportunity for the American people and their Representatives in Congress to debate the issue.

What vital American interests are involved in an Asiatic jungle which France, after being bled dry, gave up over 10 years ago?

What evidence is available that the peasants of South Vietnam, or even the military puppets who claim to head the government, really want the United States in their country?

In 10 years our level of assistance has risen from about 1,000 men and \$100 million, to 25,000 men and \$600 million—supported by a large part of our Navy, which we do not even count in these figures. Instead of improving our situation, this has left us in a far worse position than we were in 10 years ago.

What astute American general is willing to predict what the situation will be next year or the year after? Will it be fifty or a hundred thousand U.S. soldiers? Will it be \$2 or \$3 billion per year in American taxpayers' money?

But the amazing part of the whole situation is that no logically foreseeable outcome of our present involvement in South Vietnam can either help America's position in the world today, strengthen democracy, or weaken international communism. This most realistic military analysts hope only for a temporary stalemate in Vietnam.

The additional chaos that we are helping to create in South Vietnam weakens the

possibility of North Vietnam being able to continue as an independent Communist force, or of South Vietnam achieving a viable neutrality. Further escalation of this war only drives the Communists closer together—South Vietnam with North Vietnam—North Vietnam with Red China—Red China with Russia.

Our carefree willingness to help destroy Asiatics only strengthens the rapidly growing view that white Americans are quite willing to lend their military technology to the destruction of as much of the nonwhite world as possible.

All of these things weaken America's position in the world today, weaken our hopes for a stable world, and endanger the future of our country.

I would hope that vast numbers of American citizens would join with me in demanding that we have a full, free and informed discussion of this problem by the public and by the Congress. Out of this discussion should come a policy which would protect America's interest and America's future.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Feb-  
21, 1965]

**ASIAN REDS, ON BRINK OF CONQUEST, MAY BE  
COOL TOWARD NEGOTIATIONS**  
(By Walter Lippmann)

We are just seeing another attempt to form a government in Saigon, and much depends for the near future at least on whether it is able to hold together for a decent time. For the reason why the situation in Vietnam has become so critical in the past 3 months is that South Vietnam has been crumbling and is at the point of collapse.

The Vietcong have been so near winning the war and forcing the United States to withdraw its troops that Hanoi and Peiping have brushed off feelers for a negotiated peace. They believe themselves to be in sight of a dictated peace.

We, for our part, have found ourselves quite unable to put together a South Vietnamese government which is willing or able to rally enough popular support to hold back the advancing Vietcong. The American Army fighting the Vietcong has been like men trying to drive away a swarm of mosquitoes with baseball bats. However, because there is nothing else to do, we keep on. We do not wish to face the disagreeable fact that the rebels are winning the civil war.

The easy way to avoid the truth is to persuade ourselves that this is not really a civil war, but is in fact essentially an invasion of South Vietnam by North Vietnam. This has produced the argument that the way to stabilize South Vietnam is to wage war against North Vietnam.

The more thoughtless and reckless members of this school of thinking hold that only by attacking North Vietnam with heavy and sustained bombardment can we snatch a victory in South Vietnam from the jaws of defeat. They have not yet carried the day in Washington. But the President, when he ordered the retaliatory raids, no doubt intended to remind Hanoi and Peiping that the United States could, if it chose to, inflict devastating damage.

Apart from the question of the morality and the gigantic risks of escalating the war, there is not sufficient reason to think that the northern Communists can be bombed into submission. We must not forget that North Vietnam has a large army—larger, it is said, than any other army on the East Asian mainland except China's. This North Vietnamese army can walk, and nobody has yet found a way of bombing that can prevent foot soldiers from walking.

It is most likely that if we set out to devastate Hanoi and North Vietnam, this army would invade South Vietnam. In South Vietnam we could not bomb the army because that would mean that we would be

killing our South Vietnamese friends. There is little reason to think that the Saigon Government and its very dubious troops would be able to fight back, or in fact that it would want to fight back.

The Asian Communists fight on the land, and they think about war in terms of infantry. I believe that the reason why they are not terrified, nor much deterred, by our kind of military power is that they believe a war on the mainland will be fought on the ground and will be decided on the ground. There they have not only superior numbers, but widespread popular support.

For this country to involve itself in such a war in Asia would be an act of supreme folly. While the warhawks would rejoice when it began, the people would weep before it ended. There is no tolerable alternative except a negotiated truce, and the real problem is not whether we should negotiate, but whether we can.

It is not certain, given the weakness and confusion in South Vietnam, that Hanoi and Peiping who are poised for the kill will agree to a cease fire and a conference and a negotiation. But while this has, I believe, been the implied objective of our policy, the time has come when it should be the avowed objective, an objective pursued with all our many and very considerable diplomatic resources.

**Annual Nathan Hale Essay  
Contest Awards**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF**

**HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I had the opportunity to participate in the 25th annual Lincoln Pilgrimage conducted by the Meshingomesia Council, Boy Scouts of America, held in Wabash, Ind.

During the program, I was given the honor of presenting the council's annual Nathan Hale essay contest awards to Steven Murphy of troop 76 in Hartford City, Ind., and to William Van Dyke Jones, Den No. 3, Pack 49, Marion, Ind. This is a program sponsored nationally by the Freedoms Foundation as part of its effort to strengthen America's heritage.

I am always impressed by the ability of our youth to express themselves succinctly on the basic principles. The award-winning essays are as follows:

**WHAT THE SCOUT LAW AND OATH MEAN TO ME**  
(By Steven Murphy)

The oath means a chance to better myself, physically, mentally, and normally. This means a chance to improve my loyalty toward my country, my troop, and my God.

The laws are a goal for all scouts. To achieve this goal is to live a good life. The laws are not to be learned, then forgotten. They should affect a scout for all of his life.

The Scout oath and laws are important and should help guide a Scout through life.

**WHY I LOVE AMERICA**  
(By William Van Dyke Jones)

Why should anyone ask me why I love my country? Don't you love America? America is a land of freedom, a land of opportunity. Many people migrated to this

great land because they wanted to be free and not to be told what to do. And that we can worship where we please and we have freedom of speech. And if Thomas Jefferson loved America enough to write the Constitution, I love it enough to write this essay.

**Secretary of Agriculture Acknowledges  
George Washington Carver Plaque**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, 1965, I brought to the attention of the House a speech delivered last Thursday by our colleague, the gentleman from New York, the Honorable HERBERT TENZER, on the occasion of a plaque being presented to the U.S. Department of Agriculture as a memorial to the late George Washington Carver. Dr. Rosa L. Gragg, chairman of the George Washington Carver Commemoration Committee, is one of my constituents.

Today, I bring to the attention of the House the remarks made by the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, upon accepting the plaque on behalf of the Department.

The speech follows:

**SPEECH OF HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE**

Dr. Gragg, Congressman TENZER, other distinguished guests, you do the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and me personally, a great honor in presenting to us this plaque commemorating the name and accomplishments of George Washington Carver, a great American who served his country and his State selflessly and with honor.

On behalf of the Department I am proud indeed to say a few words of tribute to this remarkable scientist; this teacher of rare ability. He was a truly admirable man. He remains so in our own memory and use of his achievements.

In his quiet, humble way, George Washington Carver did far more than most of us realize to shape the development of our USDA. He was born 2 years after the Department was established, and when he died the Department had 81 years of growth and accomplishment behind it. His life spanned many of the major changes in American agriculture; and the truth is that many of these changes he himself helped bring about.

He showed how agricultural products could be used industrially, and he led the way in bridging the gap between lab research and the practical application of that research on the farm. In so doing he foreshadowed the work of our modern utilization research and our extension programs.

Dr. Carver was a close personal friend of at least three Secretaries of Agriculture: "Tama Jim" Wilson, Henry C. Wallace, and Henry A. Wallace. Two of them taught him; one of them he taught—taught in the best way of all, informally, in quiet conversations while hunting plants in the woods and the fields.

Henry A. Wallace was only 6 years old at the time, but, looking back much later, he wrote: "Because of his friendship with my father and perhaps his interest in children, George Carver often took me on botany expeditions, and it was he who first introduced me to the mysteries of plant fertilization."



royalty payments in U.S. funds—thus furthering the objectives of America's export expansion program.

As a case in point, it is estimated that if the Clupak extensible paper now made every year in foreign countries were made in papermills built with American capital—instead of under license from Clupak, Inc.—it would have required an expenditure of \$50 to \$75 million for plant facilities alone.

This procedure is in line with recent call by President Johnson for American businessmen "to limit their direct investments abroad, their deposits in foreign banks, and their holdings of financial assets."

Clupak, Inc., currently has 44 licensees producing Clupak extensible paper in the United States and 15 foreign countries in Europe, Africa, South America, and Asia.

Licensees of Clupak, Inc., serve worldwide markets from Argentina, Canada, Chile, China (Taiwan), Colombia, England, Finland, France, Germany, Japan, Norway, Peru, South Africa, Sweden, and Yugoslavia.

Clupak extensible paper, an uncreped kraft with built-in stretch and extraordinary toughness, is used widely throughout the world for multiwall bags and for industrial wrapping paper.

Clupak, Inc., is owned jointly by Cluett, Peabody & Co., Inc., and West Virginia Pulp & Paper.

I am happy to announce the presentation of an "E" Award to this outstanding company.

### **The War in Vietnam—III**

#### **EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to include the third installment of the report by Mr. Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Buffalo Courier-Express, on his recent trip to Vietnam.

Part III, which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on February 23, 1965, follows:

THE WAR IN VIETNAM, III—DISASTER STRIKES AT QUI NHON BASE

(Death can come swiftly and unexpectedly in the picturesque country of South Vietnam—and it has been coming to an increasing number of Americans there. Here, Lucian C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express, describes a brief trip to the U.S. airbase at Qui Nhon, a pretty coastal town where only a few hours later Red guerrillas destroyed an American barracks and brought death to many GIs.)

(By Lucian C. Warren)

DANANG, SOUTH VIETNAM.—It had been an uneventful, if a bit uncomfortable, flight from Saigon to this war-torn nation's second largest city, just south of the border with Communist North Vietnam.

I rode in a lumbering C-123 "Flying Boxcar," perhaps the Air Force's most reliable transport plane.

A public address system is unknown to the C-123, probably because the roar of the engines in its non-sound-proofed fuselage is so loud that it wouldn't serve any useful purpose.

#### **SIGNS**

Instead, the navigator manipulated a simple sign on approaches to and takeoffs from landing fields.

"Cam hut thuoc—No smoking," proclaimed the sign during the takeoff and landing period. While in flight, the sign was turned over to read: "Cam hut hut thuoc—Smoking permitted."

There was no accompanying sign about fastening seat belts, as the Air Force assumed that even the most stupid would know when to strap himself in.

A couple of dozen passengers on assorted war missions made the milk run with me on the afternoon's flight from Saigon to Danang. They sat in bucket seats facing each other, while in the rear was cargo and mail.

#### **TALK**

A C-123 does not provide reading lights, but a few attempted to read paperbacks with light filtering in through small windows. Most took the opportunity to seize 40 winks.

I attempted some conversation with my bucket seat mates, but shouting a conversation is not the easiest way to communicate.

I did learn that the man on my right, a North Carolinian, had just begun his year's tour of duty with the Army and was not at all enchanted with the prospect.

"I wouldn't care so much," he said, "if I had a decent place to live. The Army tries hard, but the accommodations aren't the greatest."

#### **WAYSTOPS**

The Saigon-Danang milk run provided for three intermediate stops on its 5-hour 400-mile run north along South Vietnam's coastline.

Natrong was the first stop. This, in more peaceful times, is South Vietnam's resort area. Here, Madame Nhu had a palatial Riviera-type home. Since the assassination of her brother-in-law, President Ngo Dinh Diem, she has been living in forced exile abroad.

But her home was not visible from the makeshift airport the Air Force had constructed. There wasn't even a snack bar around in which to while away the time while the C-123 unloaded and loaded cargo.

#### **QUI NHON**

At the next stop the accommodations were better. "The USAF welcomes you to Qui Nhon," read the sign on a small building, on the inside of which soft drinks and sandwiches were available.

The airport was not far from the ocean, where waves could be seen lapping gently at the beaches. It seemed an idyllic spot.

So it seemed too, to four Army enlisted men a month ago. An ideal place for a little fishing expedition.

The next day, their bodies were washed up on the shore. Their hands were tied behind their backs and Vietcong bullets had riddled their heads.

#### **ALARM**

The trip was soon completed after the Qui Nhon stop, and it wasn't many hours later when I had bedded down in the quarters of Col. Roy S. Geiger, deputy U.S. senior adviser for the Vietnamese Army's Corps I in the Danang area.

A mosquito netting was all that separated the colonel's bed and mine. Beside his bed was an emergency phone.

We had not been asleep long, when the phone rang.

The news was bad:

The Vietcong had blown up a hotel in which American enlisted men were quartered. There was one known dead and 27 missing.

For several hours, Colonel Geiger's phone was busy as he assisted in lining up engineers to rescue men still alive, but buried, in the rubble.

The place of the disaster—the not so idyllic town of Qui Nhon.

### **Presentation of ARBA Award by Boyd S. Oberlink, President, American Road Builders' Association, February 23, 1965**

#### **EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, a number of us were present at the American Road Builders' Association luncheon and were privileged to see our modest, able, and effective chairman of the House Public Works Committee, Hon. GEORGE H. FALLON, receive recognition for his outstanding contribution to highway progress. It is an honor to place the remarks of our friend, Mr. Boyd S. Oberlink, at the presentation of the ARBA award ceremony, in the RECORD:

PRESENTATION OF ARBA AWARD BY BOYD S. OBERLINK, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN ROAD BUILDERS' ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 23, 1965

One of the most agreeable duties of the President of the American Road Builders' Association is that of presenting the annual ARBA award, which is presented each year to a member of the association who has made an outstanding contribution to highway progress.

The president of ARBA does not select the recipient. The selection committee is composed of the award winners for the past 3 years. In this case, I think the selection committee itself deserves to be congratulated for its work, for I can think of no one more deserving of this award than GEORGE H. FALLON.

Congressman FALLON was assigned to the House Roads Committee when he first came to Congress, in January 1945, and has served the highway program ever since. He became the first chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads in 1949. He is attending his 21st ARBA convention.

Congressman FALLON is sometimes called the father of the interstate highway program. He does not call himself that, because he is always more than willing to share the credit and, certainly, many people played parts in the establishment of this program. However, no single individual did more than Congressman FALLON. He was the author of the bill which became the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 and set into motion the world's greatest public works program.

This one achievement would be sufficient to earn a place in the highway program's hall of fame, but Mr. FALLON has continued to distinguish himself ever since.

Back in 1956, the House Public Works Committee formally stated its intent to increase the authorization for the ABC highway program in annual increments of \$25 million until such time as the authorization would reach the \$1 billion level. Although this was a reasonable rate of growth—the necessary rate, in fact, to keep the ABC program in balance with the Interstate—the increases were never obtained without over-

coming formidable opposition. Mr. FALLON not only worked out the problem; he did it without incurring animosity.

Throughout his tenure as chairman of the House Road Subcommittee he has fostered harmonious relations with the executive branch of the Government, with the minority members of the subcommittee, with the State highway departments and with the representatives of the highway industry.

Because of this harmony, the legislative problems associated with the highway program have been worked out in an intelligent way, in an atmosphere of understanding.

On the occasion of the final enactment of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, several members of the House Public Works Committee made comments in the House Chamber praising Mr. FALLON for the manner in which the bill was handled.

I particularly like the comment by the late Congressman Dempsey, of New Mexico, concerning GEORGE FALLON:

"He is a man who does not especially like praise and most certainly does not seek it," Congressman Dempsey said. "He is a very modest person, or I would have a lot more to say about his ability. I congratulate him because I think he has done a magnificent job."

These words of Congressman Dempsey are as appropriate today as they were in 1956.

We could be more extensive in our praise, but it is appropriate to say, simply, that Congressman FALLON has done a magnificent job, and it gives me a great personal pleasure to present to him, without further ceremony, the ARBA Award.

### VFW Prize-Winning Speech

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. ALEC G. OLSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the Minnesota winner in the annual Veterans of Foreign Wars voice of democracy contest is a student at Redwood Falls High School in my district. Young David Harvey, in his winning speech, stresses eloquently the importance of the individual in a democracy. But I am especially proud of David. This boy, who presented so well a philosophy which is close to the heart of every American citizen, is not himself an American citizen. David is a foreign exchange student from New Zealand.

Mr. Speaker, with unanimous consent I place David's prize-winning speech at this point in the Appendix to the Record:

#### THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

When St. Paul was brought before the Roman governor, he used those magic words which gave him immunity from Hebrew justice "Civis Romanus sum."—"I am a Roman citizen," and he had the right to appeal to Caesar, which he did.

Today, as in the time of St. Paul, one's citizenship is a thing to be proud of, but saying that one is a citizen of a country and saying that one practices good citizenship are two different things.

Citizenship is not flagwaving patriotism, but for us it is identifying ourselves as those who are entitled to the rights and privileges of free men, and sensing the qualities of our obligations and responses to a community.

Now let us discover what the challenge of one entitled to the rights and privileges of a free man actually involves.

Today we are surrounded by forces that threaten to take away our freedom. We all have heard of these over the media of communication, so there is no need for me to reiterate all the dangers that face us. Yet we are faced by an equally dangerous enemy within that threatens to take away our most important freedom—the freedom to think as we please, the freedom to make our own decisions and to act upon them. All the time we are told what to do, what to buy, how we should do this and how we should do that, and gradually we are allowing other people to do our thinking for us. The time will come when no longer will we make our own decisions, but some "big brother" will tell us what to do and what to think. We will be told who is good and who is bad, whom we shall love and whom we shall hate.

Happily, today we are only on the brink of this horror, but it is, nonetheless, frighteningly close. What we need to do now, at this moment, is to wake up and think for ourselves. When we do this we must not be affected by prejudice, be it racial, political or religious, and above all we must stick to our decisions once we have made them. If our ideas differ from those of the majority, and if we truly and genuinely believe in them, then we must stick to them as the American colonists did more than 175 years ago.

Individualism is a keynote of our society and it must be maintained by sustaining freedom of thought, and it is up to the good citizen to preserve this freedom as well as all the others. By upholding these freedoms when it is perhaps easier to be passive, which are the rights of every person, the citizen practices good citizenship.

Yet how many people criticize and censure the individualist for his different ideas; he is reviled, insulted, even called a Communist.

This is the wrong attitude to adopt toward those who use the freedom of thought, and it is this that is challenging us today. We must accept this challenge—a challenge which, if we do not accept, will take away our freedoms. To practice good citizenship we must fight for and preserve our freedoms—the freedom to speak as we please; the freedom to worship as we please; the freedom to live without having to worry; and the greatest freedom of them all—freedom to think as we wish. Preserve them, for if we do not, then we do not accept the challenge of citizenship—for these as we carefully exercise them, become not ours alone, but equal rights of others, strengthened like links in a chain.

### Our Future Farmers

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, as a onetime member of the Future Farmers of America, I have been long aware of the keen insight such participation affords young men who learn the full values necessary to good citizenship. The role of the Future Farmers of America in today's complex world is increasingly more important.

Therefore, I am genuinely pleased to call attention of my colleagues to the ex-

cellent editorial in the Beloit, Wis., Daily News of February 17, 1965. The article follows:

#### OUR FUTURE FARMERS

Future Farmers of America Week is to be observed during the February 20-27 period. And this is one of those annual events that is fully worthy of the attention and interest of us all.

The stated purpose is "public recognition of the Future Farmers of America organization in developing better agriculture and rural citizenship." The young people who participate are brought close to the profound values that are a part of nature. They have a healthy and dedicated interest in crops, in farm animals, and in the ever-changing techniques which give our agriculture its vast efficiency and productivity and help make us the best fed people in the world. The city-dweller is totally dependent on the farmer for the means of life itself.

Beyond this, the Nation faces a critical problem of juvenile delinquency. Various cures are offered, based on the home, schools, and churches. In addition, those groups which work with youth, in all manner of fields, can do an essential job in building character, honor, and responsibility. The Future Farmers organization is one of the best of them.

### Buffalo Area Chamber of Commerce Statement on Proposed Head Tax on Travelers

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 23, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include a statement of the Buffalo Area Chamber of Commerce, Buffalo, N.Y., concerning a proposed tax on residents of the United States who travel abroad.

The statement follows:

#### BUFFALO AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE STATEMENT ON PROPOSED HEAD TAX ON TRAVELERS

The proposal to levy a head tax of \$100 on U.S. residents traveling to foreign lands or in fact any further Government restrictions affecting the natural rights of its citizens is vigorously opposed.

Such a tax not only would place an onerous burden on educators, students and others having a limited travel budget but also would add considerably to the cost of doing business abroad. It would be a serious detriment to increased and freer trade between the United States and friendly nations.

The goodwill now created by American tourists abroad would be considerably curtailed and if other countries imposed a similar tax in retribution, our growing number of foreign visitors would be lessened.

Revenues derived from the proposed tax might amount to somewhat less than a negligible \$200 million and the balance-of-payments deficit might be lowered by a few hundred million dollars. This amount, compared to the U.S. billions flowing overseas through investments, Government loans and giveaway programs, would have very little effect on the balance-of-payments deficit.

We sincerely urge that no serious consideration be given to this proposal.

the same time, I want those who recognize and observe our rules to receive public recognition and praise. In other words, let the personal reputation and esteem of a country's mission here in our Nation's Capital rise or fall on the way they observe or abuse our hospitality.

### Flint Journal Salutes SS "Hope"

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. JOHN C. MACKIE**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, since World War II Americans have realized that their fates are entwined with the destinies of people of other nations.

Not only our Government, but the people of the United States acting outside the governmental sphere have increasingly shown a desire to help the less fortunate of the world.

A leader in these people-to-people type programs has been Dr. William B. Walsh and the organization he founded 7 years ago, Project Hope.

Project Hope, the principal activity of the People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc., sponsors the voyages of the white hospital ship SS *Hope*.

In 4 years this floating medical center has brought American doctors and nurses to Asia, Latin America, and Africa, where they have trained their counterparts in the latest medical skills.

Mr. Speaker, the success of this magnificent project is appropriately saluted in a recent editorial in the Flint, Mich., Journal, and I wish to insert the editorial in the Record:

SS "HOPE" SETS SAIL AGAIN AS U.S. GOOD-WILL SYMBOL

Arnold Toynbee, English historian and author of such well-known works as "War and Civilization," "A Study of History," and "Civilization on Trial," several years ago wrote in the New York Times Sunday magazine: "The 20th century will be chiefly remembered \* \* \* as an age in which human society dared to think of the welfare of the whole human race as a practicable objective."

A feature of our social development which indicates that Mr. Toynbee's theory might become reality is an increasing recognition throughout the world that the security and welfare of the human race are interdependent within each geographical area, and the security and welfare of each area are dependent on the security and welfare of the world as a whole.

This is a concept shared more and more by a great majority of people regardless of their race, religion, and nationality. And it indicates that the field of health and rehabilitation offers an effective approach toward international understanding. \* \* \* This same area of understanding through the healing arts is being expanded by Project Hope. Only recently the hospital ship SS *Hope* returned from South America and now is headed on her fourth mission of mercy to ease human suffering in foreign lands. This cruise will carry the ship along the west coast of Africa. Earlier journeys have been to Indonesia and South Vietnam, Peru, and most recently to Ecuador.

The former hospital ship *Consolation* was taken from mothballs in 1959 and converted with private donations under the direction of the People to People Health Foundation into a floating medical school.

The ship carries up to 15 doctors, 24 nurses, a dentist, 22 medical and dental technicians, plus supporting personnel. It has 250 patient beds, 3 operating rooms, a special room for eye surgery, and an obstetrical delivery room.

The first aim of Project Hope is to teach, not treat. The main purpose is to train native medical workers in the rudiments of public health and medical treatment. However, at foreign ports of call, residents are invited aboard for examination and treatment. Operations performed run into the thousands and treatments into the hundreds of thousands. On the recent trip to Ecuador, 500,000 children alone were immunized.

The venture is one which people understand. It is providing a service in a field in which everyone speaks the same language. Relief of suffering is something that people in all countries can see and feel and relate.

Not only does the search for good health provide a common denominator among people of all nations, but it is fundamental to economic self-sufficiency. As Dr. Charles W. Mayo of the Mayo Clinic once said with great simplicity: "Sickness makes people poor. Poverty makes people sick."

It doesn't seem to be overstating the potential to point out that some of the most effective tools in the world today, as far as international understanding is concerned, can be found in the field of health.

In this field, the SS *Hope* is fulfilling its role as an impressive symbol in the far corners of the world of the good will of Americans. It is helping to demonstrate in a most practical way that imaginative private foreign aid can be tremendously effective, and that individual Americans are willing to finance it.

### Resolution on the VISTA Program

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, our country today is graced with a truly superb moving, humanitarian force, the Volunteers in Service to America—VISTA—and it serves as a great primary part of the Economic Opportunity Act.

The National Lutheran Council recognized VISTA's contribution to the domestic tranquility of our Nation at its 47th annual meeting in Hollywood, Calif., February 8-10, 1965, in a fine resolution.

I am pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to this outstanding resolution. It follows:

#### RESOLUTION ON VISTA PROGRAM

Whereas establishment by the U.S. Government of the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) program provides an opportunity for individuals to volunteer their services for periods of time to assist in specific domestic projects in connection with the Economic Opportunity Act; and

Whereas VISTA thus presents creative opportunities for citizens of good will and competence to serve human need; and

Whereas the Christian's call to love for and service of his fellow man must involve him in a service in the world; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Lutheran Council (1) register its general endorsement of the objectives of the VISTA program; and (2) encourage qualified Lutherans to give consideration to participation in the VISTA program as an opportunity for meaningful service, and a fulfillment of their Christian vocation.

### The War in Vietnam—II

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the second part of a report on conditions in Vietnam by Mr. Lucian C. Warren, who has just returned from a 10-day tour of Vietnam.

Mr. Warren is the Washington correspondent for one of Buffalo's leading newspapers, and part II of his report which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on February 22, 1965, follows:

#### WAR IN VIETNAM, II—COPTER LOSS RATED LIGHT

(Helicopters are a new and potent weapon of warfare being brought fully to bear for the first time in the South Vietnam fighting. Lucien C. Warren, Washington correspondent for the Courier-Express who is taking a closeup look at the southeast Asia war, describes his visit to U.S. Army helicopter headquarters and his meeting there with a western New York officer.)

(By Lucian C. Warren)

SAIGON.—Some old military traditions are being chopped down in the jungle warfare against the Communist Vietcong.

It used to be that generals and their aides-de-camp never got near the firing line. And for a number of years after World War II, the U.S. Army had to yield all major operations of aircraft to the U.S. Air Force.

But that's all changed now.

At headquarters of the U.S. Army Support Command in Vietnam, the man in charge, Maj. Gen. Delk M. Oden, and his aide-de-camp, Capt. Richard Kenyon of Medina, N.Y., are living proof that military traditions change.

#### SIX MEDALS

Major General Oden and Captain Kenyon each has three air medals to his credit in recognition of having flown 75 combat missions together in Vietnam.

They fly about 15 days each month in their role of helping support the South Vietnamese ground forces. Their command has about 500 aircraft at their disposal, of which 300 are Bell Aerospace UH-1B helicopters.

These are the choppers that rush South Vietnamese troops into trouble spots where the Vietcong may have the upper hand.

On the day the two men were interviewed at U.S. Army Support Command headquarters, the Bell choppers had just returned from a fierce engagement with the enemy.

#### NOT BAD

Elements of two South Vietnamese battalions were flown in to help resist a Vietcong attack in the Phyc Thy area about 35 miles east of Saigon.

The Vietcong shot down three helicopters, killing one U.S. Army crewman and wounding eight others.

At least 18 Vietcong were killed during the engagement and much Vietcong equipment captured, as compared with 9 South Vietnamese who lost their lives.

All in all, the losses have been remarkably light for the chopper forces with only 21 lost in a year when 247,500 hours were flown by Army aircraft. An additional five fixed-wing craft were downed, but General Oden considers these losses remarkably light.

#### FOR THE CAUSE

He is proud, too, of the fact that his aircraft have the highest availability rate of any air force in the world.

The general's strong "right arm" and co-pilot, Captain Kenyon, is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Duane Kenyon, of Lyndonville, N.Y. His wife, the former Virginia Mix, lives in Medina with their three small children.

Captain Kenyon was graduated from West Point in 1957 at the top of his class, and entered the Army Corps of Engineers. He has found time to take 2 years in advanced engineering at Princeton and has seen duty for 1½ years in Europe, before arriving at this hot spot.

"I think this a worthwhile cause, and I'm glad to be participating in this war against the Vietcong Communists," he says.

#### FLY IN RICE

His boss is satisfied that his men have made a real contribution to the Vietnamese war effort. Aside from flying troops to the hot spots, the choppers fly in supplies to so-called pacified areas, where the non-Communist Vietnamese are struggling to rebuild their country.

In one recent operation of this kind, the choppers flew in supplies of rice that tempted the Vietcong to return and raid the supplies. This made the villagers so angry that they cooperated in telling where the Vietcong might be found. Subsequent raids decimated these forces.

#### POLITICAL SHARES

General Oden foresees a long war here before the Vietcong can be wiped out and he acknowledges the difficulties of working with a people whose government is unstable and politically immature.

"We're willing to remain here a long time and work hard at understanding the Vietnamese. I think our difficulties will begin to evaporate, and the war will be won," he says.

If so, the work of the general and his Buffalo area aide-de-camp and their Bell-made aircraft will have made a major contribution.

#### No Time Limit

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. LESTER L. WOLFF**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of this august body an editorial which appeared in the Westbury Times of Thursday, February 11, 1965. This Long Island newspaper has been consistently cited for excellence and has also been the recipient of many newspaper awards.

The editorial is as follows:

#### No Time Limit

There would seem to be a reasonable chance that the West German Government will repeal the statute of limitations on Nazi war crimes which is due to expire on

May 8, 1965—certainly there should be no time limit to the punishment of those who perpetrated the heinous crimes committed against humanity during the Second World War, including that of genocide against the Jewish people.

We are not in a position to demand that the Bonn government revise this statute of limitations—but since the crimes themselves were of a nature that revolted and outraged the entire world, the Westbury Times believes it would be fitting that a resolution be passed by the Congress of the United States requesting the West German Government to eliminate the soon-to-expire statute in the name of justice and morality.

In the event that Bonn takes no action, those Nazi war criminals who have not been indicted or have had no judicial procedure initiated against them before May 8, 1965, will be free of the threat of trial and punishment. This, as we view it, would be an affront to the millions who gave their lives to end this tyranny.

#### A Key Post in Able Hands—Ellington Directs Emergency Planning

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has confirmed the nomination of former Governor Buford Ellington, of Tennessee, as Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, a key sensitive post to which he was recently appointed by President Johnson. As the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, Governor Ellington also serves as a member of the National Security Council.

In selecting Governor Ellington for this post, the President has wisely chosen to place this important position in able hands.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the Nashville Banner of February 20, 1965, follows:

#### A KEY JOB IN ABLE HANDS

Men who do not feel they know all the answers are possessed of the willingness to search for them—such is the caliber of stewards needed in positions of great responsibility. In picking former Gov. Buford Ellington as Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, President Johnson was selecting that kind of man. He put that important job in able hands.

Swift approval by the Senate Armed Services Committee, and confirmation yesterday by the Senate, attested to the faith of Congress in Mr. Ellington's capacity for this assignment. The swearing-in scheduled for today will launch him upon a task whose magnitude requires—in the national interest—a personal ability of corresponding dimensions.

Buford Ellington's experience is in administrative endeavor, the organizing and coordinating of effort to accomplish constructive purpose. With a job to do, he does it with the minimum of lost motion.

The Office of Emergency Planning is a staff arm of the President. Its Director advises the Chief Executive on the mobilization and management of the Nation's resources in the interest of national security. By law he is a member of the National Security Council. In wartime the OEP would be the nucleus

of an overall resource control agency. In peacetime, its task relates to the husbanding of strategic materials, and the coordination of Federal and State effort in coping with major disasters.

It is a big responsibility requiring the best administrator obtainable. In Buford Ellington, it has that best; and Washington has officially taken note of that fact.

Again, congratulations.

#### Economic Benefits From Oceanographic Research

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. HASTINGS KEITH**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most encouraging documents issued by a government agency in many months is the special report of the Committee on Oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, "Economic Benefits From Oceanographic Research."

The committee—NASCO—headed by Dr. Milner Schaefer, has made a detailed and thoughtful evaluation of future economic benefits that could result from oceanographic research, and compares these benefits with the cost of doing the research. During its year of study the committee recognized, of course, that research deriving from scientific breakthroughs and revolutionary technical innovations cannot be forecast. Similarly, dollar values could not be placed on oceanographic requirements for national defense, or the benefits, which are truly incalculable. We need only consider the strategic drop Polaris has given us in the nuclear arms race to understand the life-and-death importance of our national efforts in what has come to be known as "hydraspace" or "innerspace."

We have devoted only a minor fraction of our Federal research dollar to the marine sciences, but Federal support of this area of research, fortunately, has increased substantially in the past few years—from \$24 million in fiscal year 1958 to \$124 million in 1963.

Can we justify this rapid growth of appropriations? Dr. Schaefer's Committee answers with an emphatic "Yes." The fact is, we cannot afford not to devote greater attention to this final but most promising frontier on our hungry and troubled planet.

The committee's report conservatively estimates that a continuing national investment in oceanography of approximately \$165 million a year—not counting defense expenditures—"will be an essential component in bringing about savings of nearly \$3 billion a year, plus added annual production worth almost as much."

In other words, in a period of 10 to 15 years, with reasonable Federal support, we can anticipate an annual yield in return of about \$6 billion.

Mr. Speaker, Congress will be devoting considerable attention to our national



use of them. Otherwise the same old high-way planners will continue to make the same old decisions from their new desks in a regional planning office. A future article in this series will consider ways in which consumer groups can effectively participate in the new planning process.

## Showdown Is Only Way To End Red Aggression

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. BOB WILSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the San Diego, Calif., Union, February 13, 1965:

#### SHOWDOWN IS ONLY WAY TO END RED AGGRESSION (By David Lawrence)

The United States has every justification for severing diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and sending home all personnel of the Russian Embassy in Washington. Not only has the American Embassy in Moscow been stoned and the safety of American diplomats jeopardized—with the full approval of the Communist regime itself—but the Soviet Premier has pledged military aid to the North Vietnam Government, which has been attacking and killing American citizens.

Americans are in South Vietnam on a legitimate mission—at the request of the existing government. The attacks on them are, therefore, in violation of international law and constitute a flagrant act of war by the North Vietnam Government.

Since the Soviet Union lines itself up with a government which has made war upon American troops, the question now arises whether reprisals or retaliatory actions against the North Vietnamese will be adequate. For the real enemies are Red China and the Soviet Union, both of which have come out in the open in support of the military operations against an independent government in South Vietnam.

These acts of aggression will unquestionably continue and aggravate the situation further unless the United States is ready to call for a showdown between this country and the Communists. What is needed is action by the entire Western alliance. There certainly is little to be gained by the United States in continuing to supply economic, military, or financial aid to countries which are unwilling to take the side of the United States and present a united front to the world against aggression.

There have been in recent months various plans to expand and enlarge trade relationships between the United States and the Communist-bloc countries, which means, of course, that products which are forbidden to be transported directly to the Soviet Union and Red China are then shipped indirectly to those same countries.

Many businessmen, both in Europe and the United States, who are mostly interested in making money, have been arguing that trade with Communist areas should be expanded. But this trend developed before the wanton attacks on Americans in South Vietnam and on the American Embassy in Moscow. Under present circumstances, an economic embargo becomes a logical weapon to force some kind of international cooperation that

will restrain the enemy from further acts of aggression.

More important, however, than any other factor is the treachery committed in Moscow, where the Government itself instigated a mob attack on the U.S. Embassy.

It is difficult to see how President Johnson now can carry out any plans for a visit to Moscow. How can there be improvement of cultural relations or other exchanges as long as the Soviet Government is sending arms and supplies to the North Vietnamese to kill American citizens engaged in defending the South Vietnamese Government, whose independence was supposedly guaranteed by international agreements signed by the Communists themselves?

The severance of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union has often been suggested, but has usually been brushed aside as likely to be of no avail. The Soviets know this, and have taken advantage of the passivity of the United States.

A breaking of diplomatic relations could be based upon the many violations by the Moscow government of treaty obligations and American rights that have occurred since the United States did extend recognition. Certainly there have been few cases in history when nations have maintained diplomatic relations after the safety of their personnel has been threatened and violence has been directed against them.

## Soviet Authorities Easing Up on Availability of Matzoh

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I noted with great interest an article by Henry Tanner in this morning's New York Times indicating that the Soviet Government is making some efforts to insure that matzoh is available in Moscow this year for the traditional Passover.

Last year, as my colleagues will remember, many of us brought to the attention of the House the hypocrisy, duplicity, and official preventive measures which the Soviets took in order to stifle the production and distribution of matzoh.

We can say, without reservation, that this particular chapter has formed part of the officially inspired effort to suppress Jewish religious and cultural life.

Mr. Tanner now reports that two Moscow synagogues have received permission to make the unleavened bread available.

I am deeply hopeful that this sign of relaxation will mean sufficient supply for not only Moscow, but other communities throughout Russia.

The article follows:

#### SOVIET GRVES MOSCOW SYNAGOGUES PERMISSION TO BAKE MATZOH FOR PASSOVER

(By Henry Tanner)

Moscow, February 24.—Representatives of two Moscow synagogues declared today that enough matzoh would be available in the capital this year to satisfy the needs of Jews who wish to observe the dietary laws of Pass-

over. Three bakeries have been in operation since mid-January.

Both synagogues received permission from the Soviet authorities to set up the bakeries in rented houses to produce matzoh on a nonprofit basis for their congregations and for outsiders who put in orders.

The situation in the capital thus is different from that of last year, when many Jews had to forgo the unleavened bread.

But private Jewish sources expressed concern that the current situation in Moscow might not be typical of other Jewish communities in the country.

They urged Jews in the United States and Western Europe not to abandon their efforts to ship matzoh to Jewish communities in the Soviet Union.

Communal bakeries have also been set up in Leningrad and perhaps in Kiev, these sources said, but they added that in other parts of the Soviet Union Jewish communities had not received permission.

#### PUBLICITY IS CREDITED

They added that they thought the improvement in Moscow and Leningrad was primarily the result of the publicity that last year's shortage had received abroad.

Some private Jewish citizens said that even with this year's baking operations by the two synagogues there would be enough matzoh only for a fraction of the Jewish population of the capital, which is estimated at half a million. There are about 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union.

At the Maryina Roshcha synagogue in Moscow this morning, two dozen men and women, most of them elderly, waited in a room to hand in flour and to place orders for matzoh.

In another room, a second group of elderly persons, who had brought their flour in 2 days ago, were about to receive their allotment of matzoh in big brown cartons. There were two large stacks of full cartons in the room.

The customers paid 1 ruble 40 kopeks (\$1.55) for a kilogram (2.2 pounds) of matzoh. This is what the synagogue figures it pays for wages, transportation, rent for the house and other production costs. (At one New York City supermarket yesterday a pound of matzoh cost 31 cents.)

The flour was taken by truck to a distant suburb, where an improvised bakery had been set up in one of the few old dwellings that still have large, old-fashioned brick ovens.

Eight men and a young woman in white smocks and white caps were turning out thin matzoh at a fast clip under the supervision of a representative of the rabbi.

The supervisor said up to 1,100 pounds of matzoh a day was being produced. A second bakery set up by the synagogue in another suburb is turning out about 440 pounds a day.

George Lieb, president of the synagogue, said it hoped to produce 44,000 pounds for its 2,500 regular worshippers and for others who handed in flour and placed orders.

#### ABOUT 45-TON TOTAL EXPECTED

At the central synagogue, Moscow's largest, Chief Rabbi Yehudi-Leib Levin said the bakery set up by its congregation in a third suburb was producing 2,200 pounds of matzoh a day.

He said that his congregation had 10,000 regular worshippers and that 6.4 pounds a person was needed, or about 30 tons.

He expects the bakery to produce 45 tons by April 17, the beginning of Passover. The surplus will go to the small Cherkizovo synagogue, which is Moscow's third in size, and to other Jews who want to observe the Passover dietary laws even though they do not worship regularly.

Throughout the world, many nonreligious Jews observe the Passover dietary laws as a matter of custom.

February 25

A840

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

The problem of procuring matzoh for Pass-over began 4 years ago, when Soviet state bakeries were ordered to stop baking it.

There has never been a ban on the baking of matzoh by individual families. But few families have the kind of oven needed for matzoh baking.

Those who were not able to do the baking themselves could not buy matzoh from their friends or neighbors either, since Soviet laws forbid the production and sale of matzoh, or anything else, by private individuals.

These laws, Rabbi Levin said today, are the reason the synagogues had to apply for special permission to bake and distribute matzoh. The synagogues have in effect been exempted from the law against private enterprise in baking.

In several instances in recent years Jews have received jail sentences for selling matzoh.

The rabbi said that this summer the central synagogue would build its own bakery. "Construction materials are already there," he said with a nod in the direction of the yard behind the building.

## Sears Leads the Way in Profit-Sharing

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, a major fringe benefit of our system of free enterprise is that more and more businessmen and industrialists are making it possible for the workers of America to realize their dream of someday being able to retire in security and comfort. One plan which has gained great popularity in my fair State of Hawaii is the profit-sharing plan, now adopted by approximately 400 private firms.

An outstanding leader in this field over the years has been the Sears, Roebuck & Co., which operates one of the most successful branch stores in Honolulu. An almost fantastic story of its plan is told in an article by Shurei Hirozawa in the Honolulu Star Bulletin of February 16, 1965. Because I believe it may lead others to take a serious look at this amazing plan of a company which claims it "has everything," I offer the article for inclusion in the RECORD.

SEARS PROFIT-SHARING PLAN PUTS MANY ON EAST STREET

(By Shurei Hirozawa)

The secret of the fantastic benefits of the Sears profit-sharing plan is the amazing growth in Sears stock, which makes up 90 percent of the plan's investments.

This became apparent to members of the Hawaii section, Council of Profit Sharing Industries, as they listened to William McCurdy, administrator of the Sears program, at a luncheon yesterday at Ala Moana Banquet Hall.

Approximately 400 companies in Hawaii have profit-sharing plans.

Take a man over 50 who has been with Sears at least 25 years. His account might have had a value of \$201,000 at the beginning of 1964, and by the end of the year it was worth \$263,000.

The increase of \$62,000 was mainly due to the appreciation in Sears stock, which went from about \$97 a share at the beginning of

1964 to \$128 a share at the end of the year, a gain of almost one-third.

## AVERAGE FIGURES

What the man contributed was very minor, probably \$500 during the year.

Average figures for those who have retired show the following:

Those with 10 to 15 years' service contributed an average \$2,036 and retired with \$10,754; with 15 to 20 years' service \$2,036 and retired with \$27,780, and with 20 to 25 years' service contributed \$3,712 and retired with \$60,669.

McCurdy said Sears employees are urged not to make partial withdrawals from their accounts not only because they lose tax benefits but stock splits and stock appreciation which are the factors that increase their benefits.

For example, two men started work in 1928 at about the same pay. One withdrew \$5,000 in 1945 and \$4,000 in 1955, but the other didn't.

When they retired, the one who withdrew from his account had \$156,230 while the other had \$234,095. This means that the \$9,000 withdrawn cost the employee \$77,865.

Or another example where an employee withdrew \$12,000 to buy a house for cash in 1940. This meant the plan had to sell 220 shares of Sears stock to get him the money.

That 220 shares, through stock splits and appreciation would be worth \$380,000 today, McCurdy said.

Employees contributed \$43 million and the company \$68.5 million last year, and today the plan is worth \$2.6 billion.

About 90 percent of the funds is in Sears stock, and the rest in notes, bonds, cash, and other growth stock.

## South Vietnam

## SPEECH

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, most of the recent talk in and out of the Congressional Chambers about negotiation of South Vietnam is irrelevant.

Certainly, we must support the present position of the President to "not negotiate."

Under what authority is the United States entitled to negotiate—barter or trade away—any part or parcel of South Vietnam. We own nothing there.

We have no "rights" there. Are we not in South Vietnam simply and solely at the specific invitation of the Government of South Vietnam? Would any respectable invitee undertake to sell or trade away his host's property or possessions—let alone his freedom or liberty.

The Administration has a better "right" or authority to negotiate or trade away Alaska or Hawaii—at least in the latter cases we have some indicia of ownership.

If we have any justifiable reason to be in South Vietnam it is a responsibility—a responsibility to help defend their liberty from external aggression and a responsibility to help establish internal stability from insurgency—but certainly no right.

Somehow our State Department in recent years seems to excel in negotiating

away free lands and the liberty of free peoples. The Communists never negotiate any nation away to freedom.

If we participate in negotiations which neutralize or communize South Vietnam, I doubt that many free nations will invite Uncle Sam back. Imperiled nations will tell us to go home while they still have their possessions.

## Heroism in Oregon During Floods

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 9, 1965

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues, particularly those from the Pacific Northwest, to the following account of heroism on the part of Robert Cody and others of Estacada, Oreg., in the rescue of persons caught in the flooding waters resulting from the disastrous storms in Oregon in December and January of this year. Certainly the unselfish and gallant efforts of these people are to be commended and will illustrate briefly the terrible hardships endured by many of the citizens of my State during this tragic period.

The heavy floods of December and January which brought so much damage to Oregon and hardships to Oregonians, provided a unique opportunity for the people of the State to exhibit their individual initiative and courage. No single action better exemplifies the spirit in which Oregonians met this test than the dramatic rescue of four trapped men at Paradise Park, 5 miles north of Estacada.

At 1 in the afternoon on December 23, Estacada Grade School Superintendent Robert Cody learned that two men, Don Brown, a Yale student home for vacation, and a Mr. Barrett, both of Estacada, were trapped on the roof of Brown's Paradise Park home by the rapidly rising waters of the Clackamas River. Cody, accompanied by Roland Girt of Estacada, set out in his motorboat to rescue them. After a rough trip through a raging river filled with debris, Cody and Girt succeeded in removing Brown and Barrett from the roof. The boat then turned back toward Estacada.

Shortly thereafter the boat became caught in a crosscurrent and was hurled into a large Douglas fir tree, where it snapped in half, the men being thrown in the 25-mile-per-hour current. Fortunately, the four managed to swim to trees, where they partially pulled themselves from the river. They soon attracted attention to their plight, but a helicopter sent to their aid failed to locate them. Three of the men hung onto the trees, partially submerged in the water and in imminent danger of being swept away, while Girt climbed to the top of a house. Finally, at about 7 p.m., about 4 hours after their spill, a National Guard DUKW set out to pick them up, but became itself an object of rescue attempts when it went aground.

It was 9 a.m., 18 hours after the motorboat accident, before an ex-Army DUKW, owned and operated by John McCallister, John Kobbe, and Mike Park, all of Beaverton, was able to reach the men and transfer them to shore. On the way back in, the Beaverton crew managed to pull out the National Guard DUKW as well; but only

which, if directed into the proper channels, can effect the greatest influence for good that humanity has yet to observe. We have no election but to meet this challenge; for if we fail in this, the world's great peoples will not follow suit and abandon their quest. They will never cease in their valiant search. But rest assured, my fellow Americans, their conquest will not be an eternal one. Long ago it was said: "Opportunities are never lost; the other person makes use of those you miss." If we fail in this, our national commission, the Communists will rise to meet the occasion.

Though not totally without flaw, the Government of these United States is the most perfect yet established by man. We in this strong Nation have the political philosophy which the masses seek; we have found the answer, but all the promises we can make in this age will not sway them, for words are cheap. We live in a world filled to overflowing with tired souls; tired of predictions that never come to pass and tired of promises that are never realized. We of this country are obligated to take to the earth's four corners those freedoms by which this country was first anchored, and by which, with God's aid, it shall forever be moored. As ministers of liberty we cannot rest until this object of our march is obtained. In proportion to the degree in which we have received freedom, let us declare it to the world.

We accept the fact that "a chain is only as strong as its weakest link."

Involuntarily, each American is an individual link that attests to the strength, or lack of it, in the American cause. And what, in truth, is that American cause of which we speak? It was emphatically stated in the words of that "Firebrand of the American Revolution," Patrick Henry, when he said: "I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death." It was clearly pronounced in Lincoln's Gettysburg address: "Forescore and seven years ago, our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." This holy cause is engraved upon the hearts of all true Americans in the immortal words of America's birthright, the Declaration of Independence, when it declares, "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." This is the binding tie that, indeed, should unite our members in kindred cause; the dignity of the individual, and the equality and liberty of all mankind.

Yet, has our beloved American cause become a common term that no longer expresses a significant truth? Have we lost that patriotic zeal that long ago spurred our fathers to attain liberty? Do we lack love of country to the extent that we are no longer stirred by our national anthem or to the point that so many of us do not know even the first verse to our Nation's hymn? Are we ashamed to declare with boldness our pledge of allegiance to our Nation's emblem, the Stars and Stripes? Do we shudder to contemplate the opinions of our comrades, when our eyes well up with tears, and chills play havoc with our spines, whenever we pause to recall how dear a price was paid that this homeland might be established?

American brethren, let us rise now together; and as citizens of this, the greatest nation on earth, let us march forth to meet the challenge that inevitably awaits us; let us perpetuate to the ends of the earth those ideals which have thus far sustained us; let us so pledge ourselves to the emancipation of all humanity, until generations hence shall be numbered with us under the banner of "we the people, and America shall remain the one, true hope of the world."

## Vietnam: Negotiate or Escalate

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JACOB H. GILBERT**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House an interesting editorial in today's New York Times, which position I fully concur with and believe to be in the best interest of our country. The article follows:

#### NEGOTIATE OR ESCALATE

It is time for someone in Washington to remember John F. Kennedy's words in his inaugural address: "Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

The pressures on this country to seek a negotiated settlement of the Vietnamese conflict are approaching a point where the United States is being isolated. In recent days Russia has joined France in appealing for talks; the British would like to see negotiations started; the news from North Vietnam hints at a desire to confer; India had previously expressed the same wish, and yesterday Secretary General Thant of the United Nations disclosed that he has been engaged in discussions with the United States and other involved nations and has made concrete proposals for a negotiated settlement.

Washington, to be sure, is not quite alone. Communist China has been adamant against negotiations, and it is quite possible that Peking will refuse to talk. However, Mr. Thant, President de Gaulle and the Russians believe that China can be induced to join a reconvened meeting of the 14-nation Geneva Conference.

Yesterday, it was announced that American jet bombers, with Americans manning the weapons as well as the controls, are now fighting in Vietnam. Their involvement makes Americans open combatants in the war, not just advisers; thus the conflict has again been escalated. Correspondents in Washington are being informed that U.S. policy now permits attacks on North Vietnam even without further provocations. The point of no return on a wider war may be at hand.

A State Department spokesman goes on repeating that the United States will reject negotiations so long as Hanoi supports the Vietcong guerrillas; Peking says it will not talk until all American troops are out of Vietnam. Both preconditions are utterly unrealistic. One of the fundamental reasons for negotiations is precisely to arrange for a cease-fire and nonintervention.

Unquestionably, President Johnson worries about the effect on South Vietnamese morale of any move toward negotiations, but the recent upheavals in Saigon have indicated that the will to resist the Vietcong, even among the commanders of the armed forces, is already near the vanishing point.

Time is working against the United States. Secretary Thant is right in saying that the situation is going "from bad to worse." The notion that to negotiate would be a defeat for the United States has become one of the most pernicious misapprehensions of the conflict. The United States is amply proving its military strength and its determination to stay in South Vietnam in present circumstances. An agreement to negotiate surrenders nothing; it opens up the possibility for determining whether the goals of effective neutralization now being sought mili-

tarly can be achieved at the conference table.

The most significant thing that Secretary Thant said yesterday was this: "I am sure that the great American people, if they only know the true facts, will agree with me that further bloodshed is unnecessary and that political and diplomatic negotiations alone can create conditions that will enable the United States to withdraw gracefully from that part of the world."

President Johnson is the man to whom the American people look for the true facts.

## Message From South Vietnam

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.**

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues, and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a deeply warm communication from a family of young Americans serving the United States abroad.

To me, this message exemplifies the young Americans who are the unsung heroes of our foreign service. They are dedicated ambassadors of good will who thoroughly and wholesomely portray the American way in the large number of foreign stations where they serve our country.

I am proud to say that the Crocker family, from whom I received this communication, is from my State of Delaware. I would add that Mrs. Crocker and the children were recently evacuated from Saigon, in the evacuation of American families from South Vietnam. Dave, the father, is still on duty in Saigon.

The communication follows:

#### HAPPY NEW YEAR

For us in Saigon, the new year holds a bright hope and promise, as we see the old year fade into history after so much action, excitement, and adventure. The passing year has been a full one for the Crocker family.

The start of 1964 found us in Hong Kong, where we were enjoying an enforced vacation as refugees first class of our evacuation from Cambodia with the closing of the U.S. AID mission there. In mid-January, we returned to Washington, D.C., where Dave put in a couple months' temporary duty before transferring as a regional agricultural adviser to Vietnam. Mary Evelyn, Linda, and Tommy checked in at Stephens City, Va., for the second semester of school, and Susie continued in school in Tempe, Ariz. Dave went to Saigon in April, and the family came out in July, after school was out and Susie had rejoined the others. Dave revisited Phnom Penh, Cambodia, for Memorial Day weekend, seeing old friends, renewing old ties, and enjoying a restful holiday without the tensions of Vietnam. He brought Linda's Siamese cat back with him when he returned to Saigon, and she promptly had five kittens 2 days later.

In Saigon, the family settled into a nice new house and into the local community activities. Tommy, now a life Scout, is working toward eagle rank, and is well along

February 25

A844

on the God and country award given jointly by Scouts and the church. Susie and Linda, together again after 2 years apart, in the teen club, church, high school, and Rainbow Girls, are busy as they can be. M.E. is teaching first grade in our American community school as well as her usual church and home activities. Dave has been busy continuously in the field, in the Mekong River Delta region, to which he was moved after arrival in Saigon. His work as agricultural adviser has dealt mainly with a large fertilizer program, rice production improvement work, and the multitude of problems of agriculture in a country torn by war. In the 15 provinces of his region, he travels by armed combat helicopters, military planes, and armed escorts to work with the farmers in the hamlets of the delta, and spends most of his weekends with the family in Saigon. This summer, while our minister, Reverend Evans, was on vacation in England, Dave had the privilege of conducting some of our services as licensed lay reader.

With the movements of the past year, we've said farewell to many old friends, met many new friends, and renewed many friendships from the past, from many other places. Many of our American friends of Korea and Cambodia times were seen in Washington, and many others are now with us here in Vietnam. Several we have visited and been visited by, by mail. Others we hope to meet again in our work and travels around the globe, and our prayers and best wishes go out to all of you, wherever you are this new year.

Affectionately yours,  
The Crockers in Saigon.

### Time for Talk in Vietnam

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN**

OF NEW YORK  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, once again the New York Times has provided us with insight into the complex issue of Vietnam. Today's editorial states:

The notion that to negotiate would be a defeat for the United States has become one of the most pernicious misapprehensions of the conflict. . . . An agreement to negotiate surrenders nothing; it opens up the possibility for determining whether the goals of effective neutralization now being sought militarily can be achieved at the conference table.

I strongly urge all my colleagues to read the following editorial:

#### NEGOTIATE OR ESCALATE

It is time for someone in Washington to remember John F. Kennedy's words in his inaugural address: "Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

The pressures on this country to seek a negotiated settlement of the Vietnamese conflict are approaching a point where the United States is being isolated. In recent days Russia has joined France in appealing for talks; the British would like to see negotiations started; the news from North Vietnam hints at a desire to confer; India had previously expressed the same wish, and yesterday Secretary General Thant of the United Nations disclosed that he has been engaged in discussions with the United States and other involved nations and has made concrete proposals for a negotiated settlement.

Washington, to be sure, is not quite alone. Communist China has been adamant against negotiations, and it is quite possible that Peiping will refuse to talk. However, Mr. Thant, President de Gaulle and the Russians believe that China can be induced to join a reconvened meeting of the 14-nation Geneva conference.

Yesterday it was announced that American jet bombers, with Americans manning the weapons as well as the controls, are now fighting in Vietnam. Their involvement makes Americans open combatants in the war, not just advisers; thus the conflict has again been escalated. Correspondents in Washington are being informed that U.S. policy now permits attacks on North Vietnam even without further provocations. The point of no return on a wider war may be at hand.

A State Department spokesman goes on repeating that the United States will reject negotiations so long as Hanoi supports the Vietcong guerrillas; Peiping says it will not talk until all American troops are out of Vietnam. Both preconditions are utterly unrealistic. One of the fundamental reasons for negotiations is precisely to arrange for a cease-fire and nonintervention.

Unquestionably, President Johnson worries about the effect on South Vietnamese morale of any move toward negotiations, but the recent upheavals in Saigon have indicated that the will to resist the Vietcong, even among the commanders of the armed forces, is already near the vanishing point.

Time is working against the United States. Secretary Thant is right in saying that the situation is going "from bad to worse." The notion that to negotiate would be a defeat for the United States has become one of the most pernicious misapprehensions of the conflict. The United States is amply proving its military strength and its determination to stay in South Vietnam in present circumstances. An agreement to negotiate surrenders nothing; it opens up the possibility for determining whether the goals of effective neutralization now being sought militarily can be achieved at the conference table.

The most significant thing that Secretary Thant said yesterday was this: "I am sure that the great American people, if it only knows the true facts, will agree with me that further bloodshed is unnecessary and that political and diplomatic negotiations alone can create conditions that will enable the United States to withdraw gracefully from that part of the world."

President Johnson is the man to whom the American people look for the true facts.

### Tribute to an American

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL**

OF MARYLAND  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, Felix Frankfurter, who came to this country an immigrant boy and rose to a Supreme Court Justice died this week at the age of 82.

It is perhaps significant that the date of his death also marked the birth date of another great American, George Washington. I say another great American for Felix Frankfurter was just that—a great American. Though he was given many labels during the course of his public life, none aptly described this man, or perhaps all of them did, for he never strove to fit into any particular

niche. His guiding star seemed to be the achievement of individual liberty as defined in our Constitution. Thus, I think he could best be describe as "guardian of constitutional liberties."

The Baltimore Morning Sun editorial of February 24, 1965, briefly but accurately portrays this American, and I recommend it to my colleagues.

The article is as follows:

#### FELIX FRANKFURTER

It can be said in full truth that Felix Frankfurter was one of the most influential men in the United States during the half century of his mature, active years. He was influential, moreover, because of the power and depth of his intellect and his personality. As is often the case of men of great intellectual capacity, he was interested in everything that went on, and had his own views to express. The scope of his daily reading was enormous and the range of his conversation was as wide as it was brilliant. The glow of his originality and his convictions shone out from his judicial opinions.

He was a complex man and simply refused to fit in—or, at least, to stay in—the liberal or conservative pattern by which we try to classify men in public life. He made the law his love and his career, as a teacher at Harvard Law School and as an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, but he declined to be the cloistered professor or judge. He had many critics, for he reveled in the clash of ideas, and it undoubtedly brought amusement to him that in his early years he was denounced as a radical liberal and a leading spirit of the revolutionary New Deal, while during his last years on the Supreme Court he became a favorite of conservatives.

His influence was widespread and contagious. At the Harvard Law School he was the inspiration of scores of young lawyers, many of whom went to Washington in the early years of the economic depression of the 1930's to take part in the great expansion of the Federal Government's responsibility and authority. As a Justice of the Supreme Court his influence spread in other directions, encouraging among other things a profound respect for the traditions of our courts and, for that matter, of our entire governmental system. His last major opinion, in 1962, was a brilliantly composed dissent to the Supreme Court's majority opinion that the apportionment of seats in a State legislature came within the jurisdiction of Federal courts. He described the problem of districting legislatures as a "political thicket" and argued that the Federal courts should leave the settlement of such matters to the people and the regular political processes.

The United States was fortunate that he came here as an immigrant boy from Austria and that he gave this country so freely of his many talents. He was one of the giants of our time. All those who knew him, or saw him in the court, or heard him in lively talk at the dinner table, felt themselves privileged.

### And Now, a Tax on Tourists

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. ROBERT MCCLORY**

OF ILLINOIS  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, few proposals have aroused such outpourings of alarm as the recent intimation that American tourists going abroad would be taxed \$100 each. My daily mail bears witness to the concern of my constitu-



ents, many of whom had hoped to enjoy travel in other countries soon. Some of these letters quote from editorials, commentators, and even from a last Sunday's sermon—heard in a local church.

For serious consideration, I offer an editorial from the Waukegan News-Sun, which appeared in that Illinois daily on February 17, 1965:

#### AND NOW, A TAX ON TOURISTS

It is a sorry thing when the richest Nation in the world must consider penalizing a citizen the sum of \$100 when he leaves the country as a tourist.

When one stops to think about it, one would have to conclude that official Washington had taken leave of its senses. It's not the balance-of-payments situation that is in bad shape—it's the reason, or lack of reason, behind the proposal.

Unfavorable balance of payments means that the United States is spending more abroad than it is taking in from abroad and that our gold supplies are being steadily depleted.

American tourists contribute to the deficit, certainly, but they are hardly the sole, or even major cause. Still, the 2 million of them who went overseas last year spent about \$1 billion more than their foreign counterparts spent in this country. That amounts to about one-third of the total balance-of-payments deficit.

The \$100 head tax is frankly designed to discourage Americans from going overseas and to reduce their spending there if they do go.

It has certain paper logic. Even if no one is discouraged from going abroad, the tax would bring in \$200 million, based on 1964's figures.

But a tax on tourism is more than just the bureaucratic concept of milking the masses. Such a levy could deny the retired couple who have been saving for years, or the young college student operating on a shoestring, the one opportunity they may ever have to see the world.

The vast majority of travelers are not rich and \$100 could make the difference between going and not going on a dream adventure.

This latest adventure in fuzzy thinking is more than simply subtracting x number of dollars from x number of people. You also take away from the experience of the Nation itself. To impose such a tax would be to put blinders on the Nation at a time when it has raised itself to leadership of half the world. True, the Soviet Union does the same thing, but we had always believed that the relationship of our Government to its citizens was on a higher level than in the U.S.S.R.

It is fantastic to think that Aunt Minnie spending a couple thousand dollars to see the sights in Paris and Rome is putting the United States on the path to economic ruin. Have our experts in Washington never considered the drain on the dollar from our military stationed overseas? And while foreign aid is more often in goods rather than dollars, it too plays a big part, as do a host of other economic conditions.

If we are really serious about stemming the unfavorable balance of payments, let us consider the problem in terms of the whole world economic picture. Could changes in our business and trade or our domestic and foreign policies lighten the burden? Such a study could provide the basis for a workable and lasting program.

If we are not serious about finding a solution, then let us go ahead with this plan to exact tribute from Aunt Minnie and the others who might want to see what's on the other side of the ocean. We might enlarge the program to extract \$100 from every U.S. serviceman sent overseas also. And perhaps President Johnson might drop a hundred dollars in the pot on the way over to Moscow for the talks with the Soviet leaders.

## Need for Basic Immigration Reform

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1965

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, recently I received at my office a copy of the resolution passed by the National Lutheran Council at its February annual meeting in Los Angeles.

The resolution voices support for fundamental reform of the Nation's immigration statutes. This has long been a primary objective of mine.

Under unanimous consent I place the council's resolution on immigration at that point in the Record:

#### RESOLUTION ON IMMIGRATION

"Whereas the National Lutheran Council has consistently expressed hope that Congress will establish immigration laws, 'just to all and ministering most truly to the public welfare,' and

"Whereas the National Lutheran Council has stated its 'firm conviction that the existing immigration legislation has severe shortcomings, as a result of which neither traditional Christian humanitarianism nor enlightened self-interest are adequately exhibited,' and has expressed hope that Congress will 'seek a just and workable substitute for the national origins quota system,' and

"Whereas the statement 'Immigration Policy: Moral Issues and the National Interest,' endorsed by the National Lutheran Council at its meeting on February 4, 1960, commended for study and consideration the following five possible objectives as the basis of a revised U.S. immigration law:

"1. To supply our permanent population with a steady proportion of newcomers who have chosen the United States as their new homeland and who can impart to their American neighbors an understanding of the cultures, attitudes, and interests of other races and peoples of the world;

"2. To assume the U.S. share of international responsibility for the resettlement of refugees and of other persons urgently in need of the compassionate haven of a new homeland;

"3. To facilitate the reuniting of families;

"4. To facilitate the entry of persons possessing special skills or other capacities needed by the American economy and culture;

"5. To admit annually a reasonable number of the persons described above on an objective basis of selection which, while discriminating, will not be discriminatory with respect to race, national origin, color, or religion, testifying thereby to the U.S. recognition of the interlocking and mutual interests of all nations with regard to the migration of people, the interaction of cultures, and respect of universal human rights; and

"Whereas the proposed legislation submitted to Congress by President Johnson on January 13, 1965, represents substantial progress toward the fulfillment of the basic hopes and objectives expressed in prior National Lutheran Council resolutions: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the National Lutheran Council reaffirm its concern for a fair and just immigration law, and express its hope that Congress will enact into law the principles and objectives contained in the President's proposal now before Congress; and be it further

"Resolved, That the congregations of the member bodies of the National Lutheran Council be encouraged to welcome immi-

grants into their fellowship and to assist them in continuing integration into community life."

Resolution adopted by the National Lutheran Council at its 47th annual meeting, Los Angeles, Calif., February 8-10, 1965.

## Sixteen Eventful Years

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, the abatement of stream pollution is a matter of vital importance to our country. Therefore, I would like to call attention to the accomplishments of a regional control program conducted by eight States in the heavily industrialized, thickly populated area of the Ohio River Valley.

In 1948 the Congress approved a compact entered into by the States of Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia for the control of water pollution in the streams of the Ohio River Basin. Working together, these States have compiled an impressive record. Almost a billion dollars have been invested by cities and villages for pollution abatement facilities.

Under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the Record an excerpt from the 16th Annual Report of the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

#### SIXTEEN EVENTFUL YEARS

Today, 99 percent of the sewage emanating from communities along the 1,000 miles of the Ohio River is piped into purification plants. Sixteen years ago all of this effluvia was poured untreated into the river. To visualize what these treatment facilities are handling in terms of quantity, here is a comparison: If this sewage flow had to be conveyed away in railroad tank cars for disposal, it would require a train 350 miles in length every day.

Matching this progress in cleanup efforts on the main stem of the river has been the installation of sewage-treatment facilities on tributaries of the Ohio. Throughout the entire drainage district there are now more than 1,300 communities—with a total population of 10,700,000—provided with purification plants. What this means is that 94 out of every 100 persons connected to a sewer system in the Ohio Valley has made an investment in pollution abatement. How much? The total is about \$1 billion—averaging \$100 for every man, woman, and child.

Another goal of this regionally coordinated crusade for clean streams initiated in 1948 by eight States has been the curbing of industrial-waste pollution. There are more than 1,700 industrial establishments whose effluents are discharged directly into streams of the Ohio Valley district. Today, 90 percent are recorded as complying at least with minimum interstate requirements—and some are rated as doing even better.

These are the salient facts that emerge from the 16th annual inventory of pollution control compiled by the member States of the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission. These States are pledged by a compact, approved by the Congress of the United States, "faithfully to cooperate in the

control of future pollution in, and the abatement of existing pollution from, the waters of the Ohio River Valley."

## Vietnam

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the widely respected military editor of the New York Times, Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, has written an excellent commentary on the situation in Vietnam.

The article appeared in the February 21, 1965, New York Times magazine entitled, "We Must Choose—(1) 'Bug Out,' (2) Negotiate, (3) Fight," in which he analyzes with clarity and deep understanding the purposes and effect of our actions in Vietnam.

In calling for a strong approach, saying that we must use what it takes to win, he says that, "Our policy should not be 'unconditional surrender' or unlimited victory. Our goal of victory should be the defeat of Communist attempts to conquer South Vietnam and extend their control deep into southeast Asia."

I believe Mr. Baldwin's summary of the Vietnam problem will be of interest to the Congress and under leave to extend my remarks submit it for inclusion in the Record:

WE MUST CHOOSE—(1) "BUG OUT,"

(2) NEGOTIATE, (3) FIGHT

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

What should we do—"bug out" or fight? Should we be "hawks" or "doves"? Or is there a third choice—negotiations now?

Recent events in Vietnam indicate that "the war that is not a war" has reached a crossroads. Washington's policy of the past 4 years, based on the polite fiction that we were not fighting a war but merely helping the Vietnamese to defeat the Vietcong insurgents within their own territory, has reached a point of no return.

Compromise and consensus—perhaps applicable to some of the Nation's great domestic problems—cannot be guideposts to foreign policy. There must be a clear cut and courageous decision. And though in Vietnam we face the hard problem of risking much to gain little, the risk must be taken: we must fight a war to prevent an irreparable defeat. We must use what it takes to win.

Our policy should not be "unconditional surrender" or unlimited victory. Our goal of victory should be the defeat of Communist attempts to conquer South Vietnam and extend their control deep into southeast Asia.

The reasons we must fight for Vietnam have little to do with making Saigon safe for "democracy" or "freedom." There has been far too much cant on this point, far too much effort devoted to trying to establish a politically legitimate South Vietnamese Government after our own image. Nor does it do much good to argue the past, debating whether or not we should have become involved in Vietnam in the first place. The facts are that Communist expansionism in Asia has been consistent, related and progressive, that the end of the Korean war, without a simultaneous settlement in Vietnam, gave Peiping and North Vietnam's Ho Chi Minh the opportunity in southeast Asia they have so well exploited.

Belatedly, but nevertheless clearly, the United States became aware of the threat. Our commitments to Saigon began in the Eisenhower administration and were enormously amplified after the Kennedy administration took power 4 years ago. Today, we are committed—fully committed—by the words of Presidents and Cabinet members, by the actions of the Government, by the deep involvement of U.S. military forces.

U.S. global prestige and power is intimately bound up with the outcome of the Vietnamese struggle. In Vietnam, we are attempting to formulate an answer to the Communist strategy of creeping aggression, of subversion and insurgency, of what Khrushchev called "wars of national liberation." If the might and will of the United States cannot evolve a victorious answer to such tactics, we are undone; the map of the world will gradually become red. And if we will not fight in Vietnam, where—after the series of Communist conquests in the past 20 years—will we fight? Where will we draw the line?

The psychological and political consequences of a U.S. defeat in Vietnam, a U.S. withdrawal, or a negotiated peace likely to lead to a Communist takeover, would be disastrous in much of Asia. It would undermine Thailand (already openly threatened by Peiping), Laos (even now half conquered by communism), Malaya, the Philippines (with its growing anti-Americanism), Burma, India, Japan, and even Taiwan, Okinawa, and Australia.

For a long time after the politically stalemated end of the Korean war, Peiping was successfully depicting the United States to the peoples of Asia as a "paper tiger." The defeat of the French—backed heavily by American aid—in Indochina enhanced this image of a windy, weak-willed, feeble Uncle Sam. That image has since been dispelled by U.S. actions in and around the Taiwan Straits, during the Cuban missile crisis and, recently, by President Johnson's retaliatory air attacks upon North Vietnamese objectives. But the portrait of flabby indecision could be easily revived if the United States loses in Vietnam.

Strategically, South Vietnam is too important to be allowed to go by default. North Vietnam badly needs the rice of the South. More important, the area is the traditional rice bowl of the continent. Geographically, Vietnam is a long appendix pointing toward the rich archipelago of Indonesia and abutting strategic sea passages. Whoever dominates it will eventually control most of the Indonesian archipelago.

The strategic importance of the area is similar to the so-called rimlands, or maritime nations, of Western Europe which represent a powerful bastion against the heartland of Soviet Russia. In Asia, the non-Communist strategic position vis-a-vis Red China is based upon mainland positions—Pakistan, India, southeast Asia, and the island bastions of the Philippines, Taiwan, Okinawa, and Japan. If the rimlands of Asia fall to communism, the island positions will be doomed sooner or later. Ultimately the Communists will challenge us upon what is now our unchallenged domain—the oceans.

In a word, we must remain in southeast Asia for our own security needs. South Vietnam is in itself not vital in the sense that the United States cannot live without it. But if lost we would be forced to commence the next chapter of the world conflict in retreat, and at a disadvantage.

Despite the admitted importance of South Vietnam to the U.S. global position, the current breed of neoisolationists and the "Doves" who believe we must cut our losses and get out advance many arguments against deeper involvement and in favor of withdrawal.

Most of the arguments represent the voices of defeat and despair, caution and fear.

#### WHY NOT NEGOTIATE NOW?

Any negotiations opened now would lead from weakness, not strength. If we want to negotiate—and not to surrender—we shall have to raise our ante considerably. And meaningful negotiations are meaningful to the Communists only if they are faced with superior power and a position of strength.

We must arm to parley. Personally, I seriously doubt whether talks can guarantee peace in Vietnam and southeast Asia, as some quarters have suggested, by neutralizing the area politically and militarily; in short, by eliminating the struggle for influence between Communists and non-Communists. Nevertheless, we need not fear negotiations if we speak from strength, by really putting up a fight for Vietnam.

Continuing U.S. air and sea attacks on North Vietnam would serve notice on Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow that the United States will no longer tolerate sanctuary warfare. They might—hopefully—force Hanoi to the conference table. Indeed, such a policy would appear to be the minimum necessary to open any kind of negotiations. Yet even such a program will not win the war in the South.

If the French couldn't win, how can the United States achieve victory?

This implication of this argument is twofold: (1) We have donned the colonial mantle of the French, and (2) our power is no greater than that of Paris. Both suggestions are absurd.

As some of our diplomats have found to their discomfort, South Vietnam is distinctly an independent country—not, as in France's day, part of a colonial empire. In fact, the fear of Chinese Communist colonialism is probably greater in all of Vietnam, and in North Vietnam in particular, than the fear of U.S. imperialism. As for a comparison between the political, economic, and military power of the United States and France, there is none. Particularly in the air and at sea we can mobilize power completely unavailable to France, backed up by the ultimate force which France did not possess—a nuclear arsenal.

You can't win a war against guerrillas.

Not true. We have dressed up the fighting in Vietnam with a fancy name—counterinsurgency—but some of its basic military elements resemble the kind of war Americans have fought successfully many times in the past in Nicaragua, Haiti, and behind the main fighting fronts during the Korean war. Other anti-Communist guerrilla wars were won in Greece, the Philippines, and Malaya. The Portuguese seem to have done a pretty good job of stamping out the rebellion in Angola. Guerrillas can be defeated, but it takes careful organization, special training, and security forces that should be from 10 to 30 times larger than the guerrillas. It takes infinite determination and patience.

"Continued fighting or expanded U.S. involvement will mean higher U.S. casualties and greater risks of broadening the war."

Of course. You cannot win a war without spilling blood. We must pay the price of power. Risks are unavoidable in any foreign policy worthy of its name. The question is not whether there will be risks, but the degree of risk. For against the perils of action must be weighed the perils of inaction. Political and military history clearly reveal that compromise, hesitancy, or appeasement merely lead to ultimate disaster. In Vietnam, the longer we wait, the greater the price we shall have to pay for even partial victory (as we are now discovering), and the more restricted our choice of options.

"We have no moral right to be in Vietnam, or to attack North Vietnam."

Neither do the Vietcong. Nor does North Vietnam have the right to support the civil war in the South. Our involvement was a response to Communist aggression. Since the beginning, Hanoi has organized, supplied, and directed the Vietcong insurgency. We were invited by the South Vietnamese Government to come to its aid. A high moral purpose is an essential element of our foreign policy but we can be left with no purpose—moral or otherwise—if we are conquered by the doctrine that the ends justify the means. If we are inhibited from action by Hamlet-like indecision over legalistic concepts of international law, we shall lose the world.

What's the use of further military involvement, when the political instability of South Vietnam pulls the rug from under our feet?

Here is one of the more cogent objections to greater involvement. But in the long history of Vietnam there have always been feuding sects and factions. Moreover, the French left behind them a people still unequipped for self-government. Yet somehow or other the war has gone on, and somewhat better in some respects recently. Greater U.S. involvement—above all, a tangible determination to win—may well do more for Saigon's political stability than any amount of diplomatic pressures.

Isn't the real danger that escalation might involve us in a larger war? Wouldn't the Chinese come in?

This is the \$64 million question. It is quite clear that if the United States becomes more involved we must be prepared for greater effort by the enemy. Escalation in some form would be not only possible, but likely. But we have advantages. We are fighting, as we did in Korea, on a peninsula where our superior sea and air power can be most effective. North Vietnam's few powerplants and industries are vulnerable to destruction. The Gulf of Tonkin is easily blockaded. And China itself, with an obsolete air force and minimal naval power, could not defend itself effectively against a determined air and sea attack.

Nevertheless, an expanded effort by the United States in Vietnam may well be answered by an increased flow of supplies and men from North Vietnam, perhaps by an all-out attack by the North Vietnamese Army, and perhaps ultimately by aid from China into South Vietnam. Though the flow could be hampered and reduced by air attacks it could not be completely halted. It is quite possible that the United States might become involved in a new kind of Korean war. But this would not be hopeless by any means. In fact, some well-informed authorities believe the United States could win a Korean type of war in South Vietnam-Laos against the best that the Chinese Communists could throw against us.

"What about the specter of nuclear weapons? Wouldn't Russia join in, even if China didn't have enough A-bombs to do us any harm?"

There is no certain answer to these questions, but a full-scale nuclear war is highly unlikely. The United States has scared itself to death by its own nuclear propaganda. The fear of a nuclear exchange—never probable, or even likely—has been the greatest single restraint upon a positive and firm U.S. diplomacy since World War II.

Presidents and public alike have been inhibited by the nightmare of the mushroom cloud. Yet the lessons of the Cuban missile crisis should be remembered. Is it in any way probable that the Kremlin would risk for Vietnam what it would not risk for Cuba? Moscow knows our nuclear power. Would Russia invite its own destruction as a nation by invoking the use of nuclear weapons in any cause except the defense of its own soil? The questions answer themselves.

We must also remember the risks of delay. If there is a danger of nuclear retaliation today by Peiping, how much greater will it be tomorrow when China will have accumulated a stockpile of weapons? Time is restricting our options.

Clearly, then, the stakes in Vietnam are large enough to warrant the risks of greater U.S. involvement. Whether or not we raise our ante, the enemy will. The Communists are implacably determined to triumph, and the only factor that can prevent their victory is superior power in all its forms. More of the same on our part will no longer serve any purpose save slow defeat.

What should we do? First and foremost, we must recognize as a Government and as a people that we are fighting a war in Vietnam, not merely advising how to fight one. Such a recognition would awaken a greater sense of national and military determination, inspire a Presidential and congressional enunciation of purpose, and create a more streamlined military operation in Vietnam.

Second, the United States itself must provide maximum possible security in Vietnam to major U.S. installations, such as airfields, supply depots, and headquarters. Secretary McNamara's statement that it was impossible to guard against such attacks as those recently made by the Vietcong against U.S. airfields and barracks is no answer. Of course, 100 percent security is impossible in any war; defense against terrorism and sabotage is especially difficult. But there is no doubt whatsoever that we can provide better security to key installations than the South Vietnamese, who have been responsible for the job in the past.

We need U.S. ground tactical units in South Vietnam to defend our installations. We need infantry battalions, military police companies, Army engineers, and Navy Seabees to build aircraft revetments, dugouts, and protected barracks. Yet all this is purely defensive; it should reduce U.S. casualties but it will not "win" the war.

Another essential measure is simplification and streamlining of both the high military command and the "country team" units, composed of representatives from various Government agencies, that support our aid effort in Vietnam. We must get more Americans and more Vietnamese out of the bistros of Saigon and into the bush. The coordination between the military, the Central Intelligence Agency, the State Department, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Agency for International Development is far better than it once was. But it is still far from perfect, in Saigon or in Washington. The war has shown, for instance, that South Vietnamese-United States teams have been able in many instances to carry out the military portion of the "clear-and-hold" prescription for victory. But AID—not the military—is responsible for police and internal security forces in Vietnam, and these cadres rarely have been able to hold an area once it has been cleared of the Vietcong. Perhaps military troops should be charged with the "hold," as well as the "clear," part of the operations. Certainly internal policing needs a major overhaul.

A basic change in the prescription for victory demands a United States-South Vietnamese unified command such as now exists in South Korea.

Continuous and heavy air and sea attacks against staging areas, supply routes, training fields, camps, and recuperation centers of the Vietcong in North and South Vietnam and Laos will be necessary for any appreciable diminution in the flow of men and supplies to the Communists. The one-shot retaliatory raids have only temporary and minimum military importance; viewed as political and psychological warnings, they are likely to provoke the Vietcong and North Vietnam to a redoubled war effort.

The history of air power dictates the need for unrelenting, massive attacks. Bombing targets in North Vietnam probably would have to be broadened to include powerplants, bridges, industries, road junctions, docks and oil storage facilities. A naval blockade and naval gunfire may well supplement the air bombardment. To carry out effectively any such program as this, U.S. air and naval forces in the western Pacific would require material strengthening.

Meanwhile, it would take years of effort inside South Vietnam itself to reduce the Vietcong to manageable proportions. Much larger, and better led, South Vietnamese forces would be necessary. They would have to be supplemented by U.S. ground troops—perhaps in small numbers at first, but more later, particularly if North Vietnamese regular forces and Chinese soldiers joined the Vietcong.

How many U.S. soldiers would be needed is uncertain—probably a minimum of 3 to 6 divisions (utilized chiefly in battalion or brigade-size units), possibly as many as 10 or 12 divisions. Including Air Force, Navy and supporting units perhaps 200,000 to 1 million Americans would be fighting in Vietnam.

Obviously, this would mean a Korea-type conflict, a major war, no matter what euphemisms would be used. Nor could we wage it in the present "business-as-usual" economy. We would require partial mobilization, vastly beefed-up military production. Many weaknesses in our military structure would need strengthening. Even so, we could not anticipate quick success. The war would be long, nasty, and wearing.

No one could relish such a prospect as this; the stark statistics of war explain the President's reluctance to embark upon a path that has no turning.

Vietnam is a nasty place to fight. But there are no neat and tidy battlefields in the struggle for freedom; there is no "good" place to die. And it is far better to fight in Vietnam—on China's doorstep—than fight some years hence in Hawaii, on our own frontiers.

## Britain: The Lion's Lost Its Roar

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, U.S. Air Force, retired:

#### BRITAIN: THE LION'S LOST ITS ROAR

(By Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker)

What happened to Britain on the way to the future? This question currently interests both historians and economists the world over. Last year, a remarkable book published in England, "Suicide of a Nation?" explored the subject in searching detail.

This subject must be of interest to any thoughtful U.S. citizen deeply concerned about the security of our country, for as the British have been unable or unwilling to carry their prior share of the peacekeeping load, we have had to take up the additional burden.

A curious and tragic anomaly lies in the fact that although Britain won in the last war, the nations that lost have recovered



more quickly and now far surpass Britain in economic well-being.

I served alongside British forces for more than 3 years in World War II. Never did a people under trial show such stoic courage and steadfast determination. At the time of the Battle of Britain, at Dunkirk, as they stood alone before Hitler's might, they were magnificent. They deserve a better fate. If peacetime reward matched wartime effort, the British people today would enjoy a prosperity far ahead of any former enemy or ally.

But Britain has not prospered as have her former enemies, Germany, Italy and Japan, nor as have her wartime allies. In the last 3 years British exports increased by 13 percent. Common Market exports by 50 percent. A recent survey reports that more than half the young people of Britain would emigrate if they had a choice.

Many reasons have been advanced for this dismal picture.

I suggest, however, that when Britain's rise and fall has had the treatment of a Glibbon, when there has been time for the consensus of history, these reasons for the tragic decline of Britain will head the list:

After World War II, the British people did not go to work to the same degree as did the people of Germany, France, Italy, and Japan. The per capita productivity of Britain, postwar, was scarcely half that of Germany, and considerably less than that of France, Italy, Japan, and the United States. The British people clearly showed that they had had enough of "blood, tears and sweat." Thus, by their own decision, they deserted the "glory road" they had trod in the war years.

Next, the British people, postwar, spurned the brilliant leadership which had carried them to victory. Prime Minister Churchill was defeated in the general elections in 1945. Many friends of Britain said at that time that people who would discard the "man of the century" the moment danger passed were doomed and would deserve their fate. It is now clear that inspired, able national leaders are as necessary in peace as in war.

Finally, an examination of the state of the economy and welfare of the nations of Europe will show that those which prospered held to the principles and practices of the free enterprise system, the profit incentive and sound currency. The British followed the siren songs of socialism, the welfare state—"the world owes me a living"—and they are now reaping the inevitable harvest.

This conclusion can give a thoughtful U.S. citizen nightmares when he realizes how often in the past our country has followed Britain's example. Recognizing in time what has happened to Britain and why, can prevent a similar tragedy here.

**Remarks by President James A. McCain,  
Kansas State University, at Meeting of  
10-State Grain and Grain Products  
Freight Rates Committee With Vice  
President Humphrey, Washington, D.C.,  
February 25, 1965**

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. CHESTER L. MIZE**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1965

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

#### REMARKS OF JAMES A. MCCAIN, PRESIDENT OF KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

I appear before you today as chairman of a Governors' 10-State Grain and Grain Products Freight Rates Committee representing Colorado, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Texas. These States have in common a great flour milling industry, the world's largest in fact, with Kansas as the No. 1 flour-producing State in the Union and Minnesota a close second.

This committee was created following a conference held last December 21 in Topeka, Kans., to which Kansas Gov. John Anderson, invited the Governors or their official representatives from the other nine States to consider and take appropriate action relative to the threatened loss of this industry from these States. Gov. William Avery, successor to Governor Anderson, has vigorously fostered the activation of our committee. Presumably, I have been appointed committee chairman because of my association with Kansas State University which, for more than a half century, has served as the national research and educational center for the great flour-milling industry and in cooperation with the University of Minnesota and other of our State universities has been a prime stimulus to the development of flour milling in the 10-State area.

In behalf of our committee and the leaders here today of industry, agriculture, and government from our 10 States and Iowa, I assure Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY of our deep gratitude for affording us the opportunity at this luncheon to impress him with the dimensions of this economic crisis and its potential impact on our area, including as it does the Vice President's great State of Minnesota. Similarly, we applaud and thank the Members of the Congress from our States who have joined us at this luncheon.

Our flour-milling industry is in jeopardy because of the disparity which has developed in recent months in railway shipping rates for wheat as opposed to shipping rates for milled flour. Although our 10-State committee has just begun operations, at its first meeting held on February 16 the committee agreed unanimously on its prime objective:

"To promote the establishment of transportation rates from this 10-State region that will protect the grain producers and encourage the retention and development of milling and other processing industries urgently needed to maintain a competitive position in the production, processing, and marketing of grain and grain products."

In the threatened erosion of our flour milling industry, each of our 10 States is faced with an economic setback of major proportions. No aspect of this crisis is more frustrating than its basic cause. The Federal Government in its infinite wisdom and power has not decreed that it is in the national interest to mill flour in New York and the Southeast instead of in Texas, North Dakota, Kansas, or Minnesota. Nor are we victims of the operations of our magnificent free enterprise system. Our millers have not failed to keep abreast of technological progress; they have, in fact, continuously, and at considerable expense, modernized their plants as more efficient machinery has been developed. We do not suffer from an inadequate labor supply, excessive labor costs, or bad labor-management relations, or from discriminatory taxes. Quite to the contrary, flour milling grew and flourished in our States because of a variety of natural advantages and these favorable conditions still persist.

We are losing this industry primarily because of a technicality, the fact that for various reasons the railroads have sharply cut costs for shipping raw grain without a commensurate reduction in shipping costs for flour. Of course, this is an oversimplified statement of the technicality which in all of

its ramifications is in fact an issue of fiendish complexity.

Let me indicate the scope and importance of the flour-milling industry in one of our States: Kansas. Prior to the present crisis the 24 flour mills located in 20 cities had an estimated 2,500 workers and annual payrolls totaling more than \$15 million. These mills purchased an average of just under 100 million bushels of Kansas wheat annually from 1959 through 1963, or almost half the State's wheat crop. The mills pay \$7 million in taxes a year and spend \$2½ million annually on capital improvements. At least seven other substantial industries exist in our State because of our flour mills.

Obviously, such an industry contributes directly or indirectly to the prosperity and well-being of every citizen of the State. As an indication of the size of the milling industry in neighboring States, for the 5-year period from 1959 through 1963, flour mills in Missouri purchased annually an average of more than 46 million bushels of wheat; in Minnesota more than 58 million bushels; in Texas more than 35 million bushels; in Oklahoma more than 20 million bushels; and Nebraska more than 16 million bushels.

In deploring the loss of this great industry, are we crying wolf? I can assure you that the wolf has entered the fold and has begun his feast.

Actually, four Kansas flour mills have already closed in the last 6 months chiefly because of this freight rate differential, and authenticated accounts of similar developments in other of our 10 States can be cited. The effects of these closings are calamitous.

Let's examine what has happened in one community where a mill recently closed, Winfield, Kans., a city of 10,000. The Winfield population has declined by 280, the number of households by 80 and the number of students in school by 73. Personal income has dropped \$568,000 and bank deposits \$183,000. There are 77 fewer passenger cars registered in the city, and the number of gainfully employed workers has declined by the 80 employees of the mill plus 52 workers in other businesses. Retail sales have declined \$264,000. There have also been substantial losses in taxes, property values, insurance, bank and mortgage loans and other facets of the economy, according to business leaders of the city.

I can cite similar catastrophic results from mill closings in three other Kansas towns; my committee colleagues can cite examples from their own States of mills which have discontinued operations or may be forced to do so in the near future.

It is the height of irony that a freight rate differential subject to Federal regulation is creating new pockets of poverty at the very time the Federal Government is mounting a vigorous multibillion-dollar war on poverty.

Just how are the mills of our 10 States affected by these differential shipping costs? In 1962, prior to the current crisis, there was no significant difference in grain and flour rates from such Midwestern points as Wichita and Hutchinson, Kans., to mills and bakeries in the East and South. At that time a typical Kansas mill marketed 22 percent of its flour in the South and 14 percent in the East. This flour was delivered at \$5.85 per hundredweight which was essentially the same price charged for flour milled on the eastern seaboard and in the South.

Because of technological progress in methods of hauling wheat by rail coupled with intensified competition from other carriers, the railroads in 1963 initiated sharp reductions in grain rates without commensurate reductions in flour. The Southern Railway, for example, in 1963 reduced grain rates 53 percent, but left the rates of flour unchanged. This process has continued until the Norfolk & Western, representing a merger of several lines serving the Midwest, posted last month reduced rates on wheat



ciples of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law, have deliberately and repeatedly attacked United States naval vessels lawfully present in international waters, and have thereby created a serious threat to international peace; and

Whereas these attacks are part of a deliberate and systematic campaign of aggression that the Communist regime in North Vietnam has been waging against its neighbors and the nations joined with them in the collective defense of their freedom; and

Whereas the United States is assisting the peoples of southeast Asia to protect their freedom and has no territorial, military or political ambitions in that area, but desires only that these people should be left in peace to work out their own destinies in their own way: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.

Sec. 2. The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

Sec. 3. This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, except that it may be terminated earlier by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

Approved August 10, 1964.

Mr. KUCHEL. I also ask unanimous consent to have the rollcall on that joint resolution printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the vote on the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SOUTHEAST ASIA RESOLUTION

Subject: Resolution on maintaining peace in southeast Asia (H.J. Res. 1145). Vote on passage.

Action: The resolution was passed.

The result was announced—Yeas 88, nays 2, as follows:

Yeas, 88: Aiken, Allott, Bartlett,<sup>1</sup> Bayh,<sup>1</sup> Beall, Bennett, Bible,<sup>1</sup> Boggs, Brewster,<sup>1</sup> Burdick,<sup>1</sup> Byrd of Virginia,<sup>1</sup> Byrd of West Virginia,<sup>1</sup> Carlson, Case, Church,<sup>1</sup> Cooper, Cotton, Curtis, Dirksen, Dodd,<sup>1</sup> Dominick, Douglas,<sup>1</sup> Eastland,<sup>1</sup> Ellender,<sup>1</sup> Ervin,<sup>1</sup> Fong, Fulbright,<sup>1</sup> Goldwater, Gore,<sup>1</sup> Hart,<sup>1</sup> Hartke,<sup>1</sup> Hayden,<sup>1</sup> Hickenlooper, Hill,<sup>1</sup> Holland,<sup>1</sup> Hruska, Humphrey,<sup>1</sup> Inouye,<sup>1</sup> Jackson,<sup>1</sup> Javits, Jordan of North Carolina,<sup>1</sup> Jordan of Idaho,<sup>1</sup> Keating, Kuchel, Lausche,<sup>1</sup> Long of Missouri,<sup>1</sup> Long of Louisiana,<sup>1</sup> Magnuson,<sup>1</sup> Mansfield,<sup>1</sup> McCarthy,<sup>1</sup> McClellan,<sup>1</sup> McGee,<sup>1</sup> McGovern,<sup>1</sup> McIntyre,<sup>1</sup> McNamara,<sup>1</sup> Mechem, Metcalf,<sup>1</sup> Miller, Monroney,<sup>1</sup> Morton, Moss,<sup>1</sup> Mundt, Muskie,<sup>1</sup> Nelson,<sup>1</sup> Neuberger,<sup>1</sup> Pastore,<sup>1</sup> Pearson, Pell,<sup>1</sup> Prouty, Proxmire,<sup>1</sup> Randolph,<sup>1</sup> Ribicoff,<sup>1</sup> Robertson,<sup>1</sup> Russell,<sup>1</sup> Salinger,<sup>1</sup> Sattonstall, Simpson, Smathers,<sup>1</sup> Smith, Sparkman,<sup>1</sup> Stennis,<sup>1</sup> Thurmond,<sup>1</sup> Tower, Walters,<sup>1</sup> Williams of New Jersey,<sup>1</sup> Williams

<sup>1</sup> Democrats.

of Delaware, Young of North Dakota, Young of Ohio.<sup>1</sup>

Nays, 2: Gruening,<sup>1</sup> Morse.<sup>1</sup>  
Not voting, 10: Anderson,<sup>1</sup> Cannon,<sup>1</sup> Clark,<sup>1</sup> Edmondson,<sup>1</sup> Johnston,<sup>1</sup> Kennedy,<sup>1</sup> Scott,<sup>1</sup> Symington,<sup>1</sup> Talmadge,<sup>1</sup> Yarborough.<sup>1</sup>

#### Analysis of vote

Yeas.....	88
Nays.....	2
Not voting.....	10

Total..... 100

#### Republicans:

Yeas.....	32
Nays.....	0
Not voting.....	1

Total..... 33

#### Democrats:

Yeas.....	56
Nays.....	2
Not voting.....	9

Total..... 67

#### Positions of Senators not voting:

Not paired—position "yea" (Republican).....	11
Not paired—position "nay" (Democrat).....	19

<sup>1</sup> Scott.  
<sup>2</sup> Anderson, Cannon, Clark, Edmondson, Johnston, Kennedy, Symington, Talmadge, Yarborough.

Absent: Official business: Johnston, Talmadge. Necessarily absent: Cannon, Clark, Edmondson, Scott, Symington, Yarborough. Illness: Anderson, Kennedy.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I do not stand here to argue the legality of the action under which Congress passed that joint resolution, for I think there is no question about it. It is the type of commitment made with respect to the treaty for the Atlantic Alliance.

#### RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, my senior colleague and good friend, Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, is known not only for his ability and concern for the people of our State and Nation, but for his oratorical ability; an ability which we have often seen displayed in this body. A remarkable example of this ability and one that was seen by our whole Nation and the world, was last August at the Democratic National Convention. There, Senator PASTORE combined the breadth of his wisdom, the depth of his knowledge, and the sharpness of his logic into a truly remarkable speech that brought the convention to its feet time and time again. He set the tone and pattern for the ensuing campaign which resulted in one of the greatest mandates our Democratic Party has ever received.

Because our State is proud of its favorite son, our general assembly passed a resolution to this effect. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

<sup>2</sup> Republicans.

Resolution congratulating the President of the United States upon his choice of Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, senior Senator from Rhode Island, to make the keynote address at the Democratic National Convention held at Atlantic City, N.J., in August 1964

Whereas Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE, senior Senator from Rhode Island, has been a Member of the U.S. Senate from 1950; and

Whereas he has demonstrated through the years, his ability as a legislator and orator; and

Whereas Senator PASTORE has a record of staunch support for the administration; and

Whereas the President recognizing the outstanding attributes of the senior Senator from Rhode Island in calling upon him to make the keynote address at the 1964 Democratic National Convention: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations heartily congratulate the President of the United States upon his choice of Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island, to make the keynote address at the Democratic National Convention held at Atlantic City, N.J., in August 1964; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the secretary of state be and he hereby is authorized and directed to transmit a duly certified copy of this resolution to the President of the United States.

AUGUST P. LAFRANCE,  
Secretary of State.

#### JUSTICE FELIX FRANKFURTER

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as a Member of this legislative body, as a lawyer, and as a former judge, I have great respect for the human forces which influence, shape, and ultimately determine the course of law in this Nation.

With the death of Justice Felix Frankfurter, this country suffered the loss of one of the most significant legal scholars and judges of this century. As a jurist and as an academician, the vast influence exerted on our social and legal system by Justice Frankfurter, was always exemplified by a judicial and compassionate sense of justice. His numerous decisions and his thoughtful commentaries are his own tribute, and they will long stand as an example to those who are the guardians of the liberties and the welfare of our Nation.

#### BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, there have been many comments on the subject of the balance-of-payments problem and the President's recent message on the subject.

One comment which I think should be brought to the attention of the Senate is an article, published in Business Week for February 20, showing the point of view of the business community. I ask unanimous consent that two items from Business Week—entitled "Business Cool to Payments Program" and "Washington Outlook"—be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Business Week, Feb. 20, 1965]

**BUSINESS COOL TO PAYMENTS PROGRAM—  
PRESIDENT'S PLAN TO EASE U.S. DEFICIT  
THROUGH CURBS ON INVESTMENT ABROAD  
DRAWS FIRE**

President Johnson's stepped-up drive to end this country's persistent balance-of-payments deficit—in part by limiting private investment overseas has not won broad support from the U.S. business community.

A Business Week survey of U.S. companies shows that most businessmen feel this time the President has made a wrong move. Leaders of the Business Council backed the President's call for voluntary restraint on direct investment abroad. But few other executives like the program, and many doubt that it will work. A Washington briefing session by Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor this week—aimed at explaining the program to business leaders—cleared up some of the confusion but it isn't likely to silence critics.

**NEXT STEP**

To be sure, most businessmen will try to comply by exporting fewer dollars for overseas investment and by sending home more of the funds they now hold overseas. There is general agreement that the payments deficit—\$3 billion in 1964—must be eliminated. Says President William B. Murphy of Campbell Soup Co.: "I think business will do everything it can to benefit our balance of payments."

There is also the realization that if the voluntary approach fails, the next step could be direct exchange controls—tight rationing of the dollars that U.S. companies and individuals could take abroad. "We shudder to think what would happen if voluntary controls don't work," says a spokesman for a major electronics company.

**TWO COUNTS**

Still, there is substantial opposition to the President's program, and it comes on two broad counts.

There is the widespread belief that other remedies should have been tried—tightening credit at home, cutting back on military and foreign aid spending—before the administration took aim at private overseas investment. "My initial reaction," says Randal W. Reed, treasurer of Atlantic Refining Co., "is that the President didn't face up to the problem. He's skirting around the main issues—military and foreign aid spending." And Financial Vice President Morris J. Volmer of Milwaukee's A. O. Smith Corp. says: "I'm afraid banking and business are going to be the whipping boys for the balance-of-payments problem."

Beyond this, there's the argument that clamping a lid on private investment abroad will shake the competitive standing of U.S. companies in world markets—and in the long run cut the income from foreign investments, which now considerably exceeds the outflow for new direct investment.

Ford Motor Co., on this count, notes that between 1950 and September 30, 1964, it had "made a plus contribution of \$2.981 billion to the U.S. balance of payments." General Motors Corp. puts its contribution at \$2.2 billion in the past 5 years. More blunt is the eastern businessman who snaps: "If we lose our foreign markets, we'll have a deficit so big there'll be no way of closing it."

**NOT A LID**

The administration is not seeking an outright lid on direct overseas investment. It realizes that more dollars flow in than flow out through this channel, and that a prolonged cutback would hurt the long-range U.S. balance-of-payments position. It wants companies to finance more of their overseas investments without sending dollars abroad—by borrowing funds abroad and by tapping the earnings of overseas operations.

Companies also would step up the repatriation of funds held abroad. The administration reckons that there are billions of dollars held abroad by companies simply to gain the higher returns offered in some foreign capital markets. Companies would report quarterly on what are, in effect, their own individual payments positions.

Moreover, the program would apply only to investments in the industrial nations—in Europe and Japan.

**HOW EFFECTIVE?**

Where businessmen differ is over how well this program—with its emphasis on voluntary controls—can work.

If the plan does falter, most company executives agree, it will be because competitive pressures (and the lure of a possibly higher return overseas) pushed too hard against voluntary restraints. "A voluntary program can work for just so long," says a New York City executive. "It fails the day you realize that going along has given your competitors an edge." And a midwesterner echoes: "I can't see that Johnson's proposal is going to be effective. Companies have to move where their interests dictate. You can't stand still and let opportunities abroad go sailing by."

The big international oil companies—most of them now scrambling to set up in the North Sea gasfields—feel they could be particularly hard hit by a curb on overseas investment. Equally unhappy are the drug companies—many of which derive a substantial share of earnings from their foreign ventures. An electronics company executive argues: "If we give an inch anywhere, the Japanese will swarm all over us."

**NEWCOMERS FEAR**

Some companies say they can get by without exporting more dollars. GM this week announced plans for a \$100 million Belgian plant—to be financed through locally borrowed funds and earnings from its Belgian operations. But other companies wonder if they will be able to borrow enough locally—at rates they can afford—when U.S. companies turn heavily to local capital markets.

A number of U.S. corporations say they will step up repatriation of funds. A number already have, to protect themselves against a possible devaluation of the pound sterling. Yet there also are rumors of companies rushing to beat the new program by funneling dollars abroad. A midwestern capital goods company concedes: "Last week we were sending dollars overseas as a hedge against Johnson's action—a half-million here, a half-million there."

Hurt most keenly perhaps, will be companies just pushing into overseas markets. Says a spokesman for Cleveland's Diamond Alkali Co.: "The established companies may be able to do business with existing facilities, but companies new to overseas markets can't stop in midstream. If they do, they drown."

[From Washington Outlook, Feb. 20, 1965]

**COLD SHOWER FOR BUSINESS ON DEFICIT**

The administration goal now is to arouse the U.S. business community—chiefly big bankers and big industrialists—to what could happen if the voluntary campaign to narrow the balance-of-payments deficit should fail.

Business leaders who trooped to Washington this week got the cold shower treatment: Unless there is a dramatic improvement in the deficit soon, the administration may have to decide between tight money—and an end to the business boom—or mandatory exchange controls for the first time in U.S. history.

Thus the skeptics in this country and abroad who say the voluntary program will fall really serve the administration's purpose.

The last thing officials want is to make the administration's approach look easy.

The stress is on how tough the job will be and how short the time is.

**STRESS PUT ON QUICK TIMING AND HARD FIGHT**

On the question of timing: One of the top financial officials of the country says the voluntary program has only "3 or 4 months" to show solid results.

There is also the question of how deep the cut in the deficit should be this year.

For this, a look at the recent record is helpful.

The deficit has been edging slowly down: \$3.6 billion in 1962, \$3.3 billion in 1963, \$3 billion in 1964. Last year was the shocker. There had been hopes the deficit would fall as low as \$2 billion, and on down to \$1.5 billion this year.

The goal for 1965 is still \$1.5 billion. If the deficit averages this low for the year, the administration probably will be satisfied. But reaching it will not be easy. In the last quarter of 1964, the deficit was running at an annual rate of \$6 billion; even adjusted for nonrecurring items, the rate was \$4 billion.

**BANK LENDING MAY HOLD KEY**

Whether the voluntary program succeeds may depend on what happens to short-term bank lending abroad.

The Federal Reserve will seek to limit new loans abroad this year to no more than a 5-percent rise over the \$9 billion outstanding at yearend. This would be a rise of only \$450 million, if the goal is met, compared to a rise of around \$2 billion in 1964.

By comparison, the effort to get industry to cut down on the outflow of funds has a relatively modest potential. One guess is that a maximum of \$500 million could be saved, partly by postponing direct investment and partly by curtailing the practice of sending short-term funds abroad to earn higher interest rates.

Smaller potential savings are seen in a reduction of portfolio lending to foreigners, further cutbacks in defense spending abroad, and by cutting the limit on duty-free goods bought by U.S. tourists from \$100 to \$50. All together, these items will not affect the balance very much.

The administration's eggs are in the banking basket, although this will not be stressed in the drive to get across-the-board business backing for the program.

**TUNGSTEN**

Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, I call to the attention of the Senate a disposal plan announced by the General Services Administration, under which 77.9 million pounds of tungsten would be disposed of under the provisions of the Defense Production Act covering the disposal of the materials from the Defense Production Act inventory.

The disposal program would cover all the tungsten in the Defense Production Act inventory. This tungsten, much of which was acquired under other laws, had an acquisition cost of about \$315 million. Its market value, last June, was approximately \$105 million. By December 31, the market value had risen to more than \$160 million.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement on this subject be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**TUNGSTEN**

On February 18, 1965, the Acting Administrator of the General Services Adminis-

1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3487

SYRACUSE, N.Y., February 22, 1965.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
President of the United States,  
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I am forwarding the enclosed petitions to you on behalf of their signers who are students and faculty members of Syracuse University and/or residents of Syracuse, N.Y.

As the petition says, the reasons of the signers are various and individual. My own reasons are twofold. As a Catholic, I feel conscience-bound to oppose your current policy in Vietnam as basically unjust and immoral. I can find no moral justification for it, not even within the provisions of the Catholic Church's doctrine of "just war," a more permissive standard, perhaps, than the strictures of the gospel. I can cooperate in no way with you in this crime. Nor can I say that I am proud to be a member of the Great Society that engages in such misadventures.

My second reason for objecting to your policy is based on my analysis of the Vietnam situation as a student of political science. Along this line, suffice it to say that I am in essential agreement with Senator WAYNE MORSE.

I hope that the beclouded picture one gets of your Vietnam policy in the press is only a function of your wariness of public opinion. If so, perhaps this letter and petition will help you to see your way clear to a different course of action.

Until such time, I remain in sincere and complete opposition to you on this topic.

Very truly yours,

EVERT MAKINEN.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed is a copy of a letter and petition that I have sent to the President. A copy has also been sent to Senator FULBRIGHT.

Together with the others who signed the petition, I am hoping that this small action on our part will provide support for your efforts and encourage you and Senators CHURCH, McGOVERN, GRUENING, and others to continue in your efforts to change the course of the administration's policy.

My wife and I were very happy to hear you speak on the Syracuse University campus recently. I wonder if it would be possible for you to send us a copy of that speech, together with a copy of the remarks you have printed on pages 242-253 of the 1965 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 6.

Sincerely,

EVERT MAKINEN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I firmly applaud your stand in favor of a negotiated settlement of the situation in Vietnam through peaceful means.

Your actions are much, greatly appreciated, and lend hope and inspiration to an otherwise cloudy picture.

Please continue your efforts; you are right.

Yours,

J. SULLIVAN.

HON. WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank the good Lord we have a courageous man like you, who is not afraid of being a loud and clear opposition and who raises his voice in defense of truth and sanity.

We need to hear your point of view more often.

How can we bring your ideas to the people more often so they can see for themselves that there is another point of view?

The trend of the times since Roosevelt's day seems to me to have been defined in one single easy conclusion. We're the good guy in the story, and Moscow is the bad guy, or China, and that is all there is to it.

No. 37—5

But the turmoil of our world is much more complex when so many millions of peoples are involved, in tiny nations as well as great ones; therefore, I feel the problems which confront the world will not necessarily be solved by our way, nor will force bring our way about any sooner. Why can't we have a newscast from our Government in which all sides of a picture are freely discussed?

Whether we live or die in atomic war is too grave a question to leave to our leaders. If we are going to chance annihilation, we, too, should have a clear view about that which we give up all humanity for.

Why shouldn't we help decide?

What I and many of your admirers would like is to hear from you more often (and men like you). Only truth on all sides and logic can keep us free and safe.

Thank you for fighting always for the right as you see it.

We wish there were many more peoples' representatives like yourself.

Sincerely,

Mrs. PAULINE DICKSON.

FARMINGTON, PA.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have just sent the following telegram to the President:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Our hearts cry out for peace. We beg you to lead the American people and the world away from the abyss of escalating war in Vietnam. Friendly nations, the United Nations, leaders of worldwide stature have offered their services to help us overcome the obstacles to peace. We beg you to hear the world's longing in this crucial hour and to lead us into the ways of peace."

We appreciate very much and are grateful to you that you have raised your voice on this issue, and used your influence to prevent precipitate action. We would like you to know our support for this.

Respectfully yours,

FOR THE SOCIETY OF  
BROTHERS:

ARTHUR WISER,  
JOHN WINTER,  
DONALD NOBLE,  
ANDREAS MEIER,  
MICHAEL BRANDES,  
JOHANN C. ARNOLD.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Bravo for your courageous stand on the Vietnam fiasco. It is through voices like yours that the truth will finally seep through to the public. If we can't get the United States to recognize its illegality, perhaps whoever is running this show, will get around to negotiate rather than retalliate. Instead of bombing to show the strength which the whole world knows we have, we can show our strength of character by a unilateral cease-fire. This should bring many more benefits to us in the world, than any display of our well-known military capacities.

Sincerely,

PHILIP BRANDSTEIN.

DULUTH, Minn.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
President, United States of America,  
White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are extremely concerned about the situation in Vietnam. Long articles, not to mention books, have been written on the subject. We do not intend, herein, to develop involved points of view and further we recognize that this is not a simple situation.

We do however want to make a few obvious observations:

1. We live in a nuclear age. It is difficult for the average human mind to grasp fully the implications of this. The magnitude of the destructive possibilities should not escape the grasp of those in positions of leadership who are in effect the custodians of the results of thousands of years of slow and painful development of the human race.

2. Vietnam is in the backyard of China. This is not said to excuse any abuse of the responsibility of elementary neighborliness by any nation anywhere, except to pose the question this way:

What would our reaction be if some other nation was engaged in military action in Mexico or Canada?

Would such actions be inclined to encourage friendly attitudes and potential relations or suspicion and hatred?

3. What evidence do we have of the desire of the South Vietnamese for the kind of protection we are giving them? This last question directed to the chaotic game of "musical chairs" currently played by the various in and out factions vying for power in South Vietnam.

We feel strongly about this situation. Our friends and neighbors and associates generally are expressing a growing uneasiness over this situation.

We urge that our Government respond to the suggestions of numerous governments, the U.N. Secretary General, the Pope, and various other organizations and individuals and agree to participate in a broad conference of all interested parties seeking to find a peaceful settlement for this war weary people and an ultimate disengagement of our Armed Forces.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE E. and RHODA L. DIZARD.

Copies to the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President; Hon. EUGENE MC-CARTHY, U.S. Senator; Hon. WALTER F. MONDALE, U.S. Senator.

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA,  
Norman, Okla.

The Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your courageous stand on the South Vietnam war will be remembered by those of us who since every time our Government issues an official statement on that war as a welcome voice allaying our frustrations caused by lack of a forum. Your thorough article that appeared some time ago in the New York Times Sunday magazine I found irrefutable.

My wife and I, both, are native Oregonians. We are proud to claim you as a Senator from our home State. We enjoy the arguments that our esteem for you gets us into.

If it is possible, we would appreciate any materials that you could send on the Vietnam war so that we may better enlighten our friends of "the other view."

Very truly yours,

HERBERT W. TITUS,  
Assistant Professor of Law, University of Oklahoma.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please continue your present course on Vietnam.

Your course and that of Senator GRUENING have set the pace and, with recent recruits to your side, can well turn the tide.

Please do not falter.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT MELTON.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, next week I hope to have finished a speech that I am now preparing in answer to others that have been given in the Senate in recent days by my colleagues who

want to continue America's aggressive policies in Asia. The advocates of a war-hawk approach in our course of action in southeast Asia ought to ponder for a long time the statement issued yesterday by Secretary General of the United Nations U Thant. That is particularly true for those in the Senate who are trying to cover over the fact that there is a civil war going on in southeast Asia.

One of the most remarkable announcements of recent days was that this is not a civil war at all. Mr. President, it is completely a civil war, plus the aggressive course of action of the United States participating where it has no business or right to be.

Mr. U Thant made it perfectly clear yesterday that it was a civil war. One of the saddest hours is the hour in which we find the administration of our Government releasing statements to the press to the effect that it is not interested in negotiating a peace.

I say with sadness in my heart that, in my judgment, the United States of America is the greatest threat to the peace of the world in this dark hour. We are the greatest threat to the peace of the world because of the illegal war that we are fighting in southeast Asia quite openly and blatantly, with American jet planes dropping bombs on North Vietnam. These planes are completely manned by American military personnel. This is being done without a declaration of war.

Let me say to the war hawks in the Senate and House of Representatives, "You ought to bring in a declaration of war, if you really want to support a war in southeast Asia."

I shall continue to pray that reason and sense will come to pervade the leaders in the Pentagon, the State Department, and the White House so that America will stop its shocking outlawry. If we continue this course of action—and let someone in the Senate deny it on the basis of the briefings we have heard in recent days—we are bound to provoke Red China into committing an overt act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I be permitted to speak for 1 additional minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, that will give the war hawks of the Pentagon, the State Department, and the White House an excuse, but not a reason, to bomb the Chinese nuclear installation—which I am satisfied is their objective and has been their objective for some time.

When that installation is bombed, the big show will be on. Let no one deny that it would require sending to Asia immediately no less than 300,000 American boys who would start meeting Chinese ground forces that would be poured in, to the number of several million—300,000 American soldiers would be but a start in the sacrifice that the United States would have to make in the event of an all-out war on the ground in Asia, which we can never win, I care

not how many American divisions we pour into Asia. We would bog this country down for 25 or 50 years, and drain it dry in materiel and blood, until some candidate for President runs on a platform of "I will go to Vietnam" and negotiate a settlement.

This is a critical hour in the history of our Republic. My voice will continue to be raised in opposition to my Government's warmaking policies in Asia, short of a declaration of war. Present that declaration of war; vote it through Congress; and, on the basis of the present facts, I shall vote against it. But once we vote for a declaration of war, I shall urge that we unite behind that declaration until we can somehow, in some way, put that war behind us. But that war, plus our present outlawry in southeast Asia, does not have a scintilla of justification to support it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I believe that I reflect the views of the American people when I say that we are a peace-loving country.

We joined the United Nations because we believe in peace. We seek no aggrandizement. We desire no colonies. We have the responsibility of leadership, as I see it, in the cause of peace with justice around this unhappy globe.

The senior Senator from Oregon is my friend. But the Senator from Oregon is completely in error in the comments which he has just made.

I suggest that, 10 years after the President of the United States saw fit to respond to a call for assistance by the people in the Government of South Vietnam, it is far too late to argue whether we should have taken that position at that time.

Let me recall that only a year ago Congress overwhelmingly adopted a resolution clothing the President with complete authority to utilize the might and power of the people of the United States with respect to the commitment that this country, in 1954, had made. Representatives of the Senate and the House of Representatives overwhelmingly gave that kind of authority to the President.

An agreement was reached in 1954. The major nations of the world, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, participated in that agreement. That agreement was that there would be no further marauding from north of the 17th parallel to the south.

I agree with the President. This sad conflict can be terminated immediately if the Communists abide by the agreement which was entered into in 1954. In the meanwhile, as an American citizen, I support the President of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall take 3 minutes to reply to the Senator from California.

I completely disagree with the premises laid down. In the first place, the United States started immediately to violate the same agreement that the Senator from California is talking about. We did not negotiate the agreement. We did not even sign the agreement. The neutral commission that was set up has found us to be in violation of it.

Why do people who continue to advocate the outlawry in South Vietnam not tell the American people the facts about our violation of that agreement? The Secretary General of the United Nations knows those facts and it may be that Americans will have to learn from him what our own Government will not tell us.

The Senator from California repeats the argument that we made a commitment in South Vietnam. Whether we set up that puppet government in 1954 or not, that is our puppet today. That fact does not give us any right to make war in South Vietnam.

The Senator spoke about the United Nations. No nation is as gully of scuttling the United Nations at the present time as is the United States, as a result of the conduct of our United Nations Ambassador in the latest session. To think that our Ambassador would stand up and try to tell the American people that we voted only on a matter of procedure the other day. The United Nations voted. Mr. President, are you surprised to hear the spokesman for Red China say, as announced in the press, that the United States has lost its case in the United Nations because of the surrender we made on the vote the other day? The sad fact is—I am sorry it must be admitted—that he is correct. The United States has much to answer for in the shocking position it took which resulted in the weakening of article 19 of the United Nations Charter. We should have held Russia's and France's noses to the grindstone. A better figure of speech would be that we should have held them to the rule of law. We have let France and Russia get away with defying the charter of the United Nations.

I repeat now, by reference, every word I said to which the Senator from California attempted to reply. Now is the time for the United States to make clear to the world that we are willing to negotiate honorably, but only honorably, for an honest settlement in Asia. Let me say to the Senator from California that if we continue this action we are going to get the world in an unnecessary war.

The argument that we have given power to the President to act overlooks the fact that we do not have the constitutional authority to delegate our power under article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

I shall always be glad to have my descendants read that I voted against the resolution to which the Senator referred. The resolution cannot give the President legal power to make war. Congress ought to adopt another resolution, a declaration of war, if that is what Congress wants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record the text of the Indochina joint resolution passed at the previous Congress.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas naval units of the Communist regime in Vietnam, in violation of the prin-



places, that the South Vietnamese are vastly better off than their countrymen to the North.

When I went to Vietnam, I shared the common Canadian view of such faraway places. I half suspected that, for those unfortunate enough to live in such countries, life in the free sector was just about as miserable as life under communism. But a few visits to Hanoi and other Communist centers quickly disabused me of this notion. I'll never forget the people who would pass me on the streets and whisper "A bas les Communistes," or the officials who risked their freedom to tell me privately of their hatred for the regime of Ho Chi Minh. It was a rude contrast with Saigon, where free speech, while not prevalent, is at least still possible.

For all their strategic failings, the Americans are fighting a just war. But they're going to lose it unless they make drastic changes—for at present, the American is his own worst enemy in Vietnam. By his obtuse policies and actions he has squandered the good will of his allies. Without it, he can't win. Without it, there is nothing left to win.

DULUTH, MINN.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My wife and I wish to thank you for your courageous efforts and sound thinking about the Vietnam mess.

May your efforts meet with increased and growing support and be ultimately crowned with success. Were it not for voices like yours, one would be inclined to think he were habitating a giant madhouse.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter we are sending to President Johnson and our Senators as well as Vice President HUMPHREY.

Again may be express our appreciation for your outspoken intelligent attitude and further advise you that countless numbers of our friends, neighbors and associates share our views.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE E. and RHODA L. DIZARD.

RUSCOMB PRODUCTS CO.,  
Fleetwood, Pa.

PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: As a free and independent man I urge you to reconsider our present policy in Indochina.

This policy has alienated Cambodia and continues to hurt our image in many otherwise friendly nations. We have given full support to one dictatorship after another in South Vietnam, thereby, probably pushing those people closer to communism.

As a mature nation we are surely capable of altering our policies when necessary without fear of losing prestige.

Very truly yours,

FREDERICK SCHWARTZ,  
President.

RUSCOMB PRODUCTS CO.,  
Fleetwood, Pa.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: There have been many occasions in the past years that I have read with admiration, of the positions you have taken on various issues.

I agree with your views concerning U.S. foreign policy in southeast Asia.

You are courageous and I wish there were many more Senators like you.

Very truly yours,

FREDERICK SCHWARTZ,  
President.

PIONEER METHODIST CHURCH,  
Portland, Oreg.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SIR: Please accept my support in your attempts to get the war in Vietnam stopped.

Which is more dishonorable? To pull out now without victory? or to wait 3 years and pull out then still without victory?

Sincerely yours,

P. MALCOLM HAMMOND.

#### RESOLUTION ON SOUTH VIETNAM

"Whereas the conflict in South Vietnam has reached such proportions that it threatens to escalate into a third world war; and

"Whereas it is becoming more apparent daily that the presence of the U.S. forces is an anathema to the citizens of South Vietnam; and

"Whereas the vast sums of money that our country is expending could be put to use in more humane ways in our own country, instead of supporting a group of militarists who do not have the confidence of their own people; and

"Whereas our posture as so-called advisers to South Vietnam has become untenable morally and economically; therefore be it

"Resolved, That the 57th Assembly District Council Issues Conference of the California Democratic Council urge in the best interests of the United States and all parties concerned that our Government find means immediately to negotiate a settlement of this conflict."

Moved, seconded, and passed on February 20, 1965, at said Issues Conference, Encino Community Center, Encino, Calif.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are enclosing a copy of two resolutions acted upon by our council. We submit them for and request your thoughtful action.

RICHARD J. HUNTER,  
First Vice Chairman, 57th Assembly  
District Council, California Democratic Council.

BINGHAMTON, N.Y.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to you to express my support of your position on Vietnam. Further U.S. military action in this area can lead to a situation where freedom for all peoples and all nations will be at an end, where everything of value will be utterly destroyed.

The United States can do as much as almost any nation in the world to turn away from a course toward war and toward one where meaningful and moral acts are possible. Military action cannot achieve the goals of freedom or self-determination. The choice of the United States may be the most crucial one in history.

Sincerely yours,

ALICE SARDELL.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I agree with your views on Vietnam 100 percent and all this intervention will just bring on a big war.

We've got enough problems here at home without worrying about every country in the world. All we're doing is making enemies by supplying arms and giving our money away.

You're doing a fine job and many people are with you, thank you very much.

Sincerely,

EDWIN J. KOZELUH.

WILLOUGHBY OHIO.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I read in the Cleveland Plain Dealer about your speech in City Club Forum. We are proud to say, you are one of our greatest Americans.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH RENZ and WIFE.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Although I am not one of your constituents, I am taking the liberty to write to you to express my appreciation for the position you are taking concerning our involvement in Vietnam.

One hears the voice of reason and justice in your speeches, and I trust it will reach more and more people in our country. I feel grateful to you for your statesmanlike approach to this problem.

Sincerely yours,

PETER R. PRIFTI.

SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR: You have put up a good, long, honest fight to get our troops out of that Vietnam mess. We hope and pray that God gives you the strength and health to keep on fighting.

Why do we have such fools for leaders?

Yours respectfully,

JACK E. O'DONALD.

ROYAL OAK, MICH.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Mr. DIRKSEN says "are we going to run away from the Communists?" I might remind him, we have been running from them since the Korean war. We couldn't lick the North Koreans, how we going to defeat Red China?

We shelved the big bomb during the Korean war; the Russians didn't explode their first atom bomb until 1952. Then, they had no stockpile in 1950 at the outset of the Korean conflict. Why didn't we explode the atomic bomb against North Korea? We didn't hesitate to use it on the Japs.

Mr. Morse, we cannot defeat Red China without the use of nuclear weapons. That is very evident. We cannot afford a long, drawn out, jungle war.

We have but two alternatives; viz:

We can furnish Chiang Kai-shek atomic weapons and let him fight his way back to the mainland; or

We can pull out entirely from southeast Asia and wait for Russia and Red China to eventually engage each other in an all-out conflict.

In any case we must not make the tragic mistake of exchanging frontline pawns with Red China.

Yours truly,

MELVIN I. SMITH.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.

SENATORS MORSE, MCGEE, FULBRIGHT, MANFIELD, and GRUENING,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

SIRS: I wish to express my heartfelt appreciation for whatever you have done in your effort to get someone to listen to the wish of people who really think, to call a halt to this foolish fighting in Vietnam.

The beginning, of course, must be a cease-fire and withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam but to stop there would be pretty negative.

I think there needs to be widespread publicizing of proposals for and actual beginnings on an extensive "TV" type of development of the Mecong Delta resources for power which could make possible the sort of economic development which would form the basis for the increased human welfare which is the really deep need in this trouble area.

To move forward in this area with aid comparable to that which we are pouring down the drain in military action would—or could—go a long way toward allaying the fears of those who feel that withdrawing our troops might throw wide open the doors to a Communist takeover.

It seems to me that the ones who arrive "the fastest with the mostest" of what will really help the people will render an inestimable service not only to the people of

February 25

Vietnam but to mankind as a whole. For it seems to me that this is the only dependable way to work at stabilizing the situation there and preventing the spreading of hostilities.

Keep up your good work—and expand it in every way possible.

Very truly yours,

MARIE E. ANDERSON.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my wholehearted agreement with the views you expressed here on what we should do in South Vietnam—I oppose escalation of the war there. I believe that we should do everything we can possibly do through diplomatic channels to bring about a peaceful settlement in that war-torn and politically unstable country.

I agree with your ideas of exporting economic freedom to underdeveloped countries. I do not believe in giving military aid to countries which can then use this military aid against us and those we support. Look at what Sukarno is up to now.

Thanks for coming to Cleveland and expressing your views. They need to be heard.

Yours truly,

KATHERYN S. WEITZEL.

McMINNVILLE, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to commend you on your forthright stand concerning Vietnam. Any expansion of the war would be suicidal—and I only hope that it is not too late to negotiate honorably.

While I often disagree with you, I admire your courage and honesty. On this problem, I am 100 percent with you.

Sincerely yours,

CARLE H. MALDUE.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing you to tell you that many people around the country are grateful to you for your efforts to prevent America getting involved in a world war in Asia. We hope that you will keep it up, so that all will know that the American people are not ready to rubberstamp an escalation. We hope that you will continue to attack the policy of retaliation in the North.

There follows a short poem in honor of the present confusion:

"Big Minh, Khanh, and Little Minh,  
When one is out, the other's in.  
Who's in charge? We do not know.  
He surely stands for freedom though.  
And if we risk a world war,  
It's certainly worth dying for."

Sincerely yours,

DAVID B. BARRON, M.D.

BERKLEY, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We strongly support your position of favoring negotiations on the question of South Vietnam.

Yours truly,

Prof. and Mrs. HERBERT STRAUSS.

CARMEL, CALIF.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I certainly agree with you about a cease fire and negotiate a peace in Vietnam and get out of there. We cannot police the world. The U.N., instead of recessing, should have stayed in session and have done something about the mess out there. I heard you and the Senator from

Alaska speak about getting out of Vietnam, over a year ago.

Best regards to you,

EMILY L. TURNER.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Have you seen the article in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists (December 1964), which outlines the remarkable work which many countries are joining in to develop the lower Mekong Valley?

It describes a more humanitarian solution to Vietnam than the course we are pursuing. You are no doubt familiar with the subject matter of the article, but it does set it out in complete form.

Why can't we support this instead of shooting each other?

Sincerely,

MARIE BLISS.

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to commend you for your brilliant views on the Vietnam crisis. I feel very strongly for a settlement and withdrawal. I sincerely hope you continue your strong stand concerning this vital situation.

Thank you very much,

JEFFREY BERLINER.

PORTLAND, OREG.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senator:

It is hard to believe that the United States deliberately is trying to settle a dispute by force outside the United Nations. The United Nations was created to avoid future wars, to negotiate differences. All countries should take part in this matter. In order to be effective for disarmament, an army consisting of members of all countries should be the only body to have the right to police and watch that nobody is able to arm secretly.

Sincerely,

E. MERKI.

LEBANON, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We implore you to use all the influence you have to stop this foolhardy mission in Vietnam.

We worked hard for Johnson before election, but feel that he has betrayed the hopes and trust of Democrats and Republicans alike.

We are not concerned with "loss of face." (Leave that to the orientals.) We are concerned with peace in the United States. Martin Luther King made more sense in his TV message to his people on nonviolence, than any of the soothing syrup that has come out of Washington. This is an insult to any American who can read. We can see the flag-draped coffins of our men, who died needlessly.

Before we set out to show another country how to run their government, let us repair our own. For this purpose, Americans will more gladly give their hard earned tax money. We need our money here at home to take care of our old people. We need it for education. We need it for the protection of our citizens from criminals.

I wish I could say all these things to President Johnson, but I would have to have a fairy godmother to make that possible.

I am a Democrat. I am an American. I hope that some day I can say that proudly again, and in any country I might be in. Today, I would be afraid to travel, because we are hated and scorned.

May God grant you power and health,  
WAYNE MORSE. You have not let us down.  
Very sincerely,

WINNIE THOMPSON.

ELMA, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Enclosed with this letter is a copy of a letter we have addressed to Senator KENNEDY of New York, also to Representative RICHARD MCCARTHY of the 39th Congressional District, New York.

We fully endorse the stand you take in the Senate in relation to our activities in southeast Asia and we believe you will be interested to know that there are some people like us who share your views and who sympathize with the victims of the U.S. militarists and their allies. We reject completely all military activities. They are vicious, cruel, and stupid and entirely unfit for human beings to engage in.

Respectfully yours,

R. W. and G. H. BAUM.

ELMA, N.Y.

Senator ROBERT KENNEDY and  
Representative MCCARTHY:

The writers of this letter wish to express their feeling of horror concerning the vicious activities of the U.S. military machine on the rampage in southeast Asia. Are these really the acts of human beings? Is Congress really so helpless in the wake of all of this vicious brutality? Is Congress a mere rubber stamp for the Pentagon and its allies?

Won't you do your part to put an end to this disgraceful performance, demanding that U.S. forces be brought home where they belong? The people of southeast Asia must be permitted to settle their affairs peacefully, which they would have done years ago if they had been permitted to do so.

Mr. Eisenhower, when President, addressing a Governor's Conference on August 4, 1958, had this to say:

"Now let us assume that we lost Indochina \* \* \* the tin and tungsten that we so greatly value from that area would cease coming."

"So when the United States votes \$400 million to help that war, we are not voting a give away program. We are voting for the cheapest way that we can prevent the occurrence of something that would be of a most terrible significance to the United States."

And to obtain cheap tin and tungsten and more on our own terms we have become the world's most loathesome people. Hiroshima is not forgotten.

R. W. and G. H. BAUM.

We, the undersigned, wish to state our firm opposition to the continuation of current U.S. policy in Vietnam. Our reasons are various and individual, but we are together in calling for an immediate cessation of American military activities in Vietnam, in calling for the U.S. Government to seek actively a negotiated settlement, and in supporting Senators MORSE, GRUENING, MCGOVERN, CHURCH, and other public officials who have dared to challenge the administration's orthodoxy and who have called for a negotiated peace in Vietnam.

We also call upon Senator FULBRIGHT and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to conduct thorough and public hearings on the Vietnam policy of the United States in order that the American people may know exactly what their Government has been doing there and why.

James D. Hunt, Evert Makinen, Bert Fowler, Robert Laine, Carl Beal, David Borthwick, Byron Fox, Harvey Bates, Vernon Blefer, Morris Barker, Bill Eckhouse, Sandra Ann Dryers, Jill Ferguson, Judy Labau, John A. Strong, A. Achanya, Joao Webba, David Wiener, Patrick Brumzawcebridge, Alfred D. Bredber, and Anbin Pesko.

Law, chemistry; Jeana Levinthal, medical school; Bernard Lown, public health; Carlton Maley, history of science; Jean Mayer, public health; Everett Mendelsohn, history of science; Matthew Messelson, biology; John E. Murdoch, history of science; Martin Peretz, government; Elmer Pfefferkorn, medical school; Edward P. Radford, Jr., public health; John R. Raper, biology; Herbert Richardson, theology, divinity; W. R. Riddington, Jr., anthropology; Paul A. Riemann, divinity; Gerald Rosenthal, economics; Robert Rotberg, history; William M. Sacks, astronomy; Victor W. Sidel, preventive medicine; Raymond Siever, geology; Steven Smith, philosophy; Joseph L. Snider, physics; Rui Soeiro, medical school; Max Stackhouse, ethics, divinity; Edward A. Sweeney, dental medicine; John T. Tate, mathematics; Karl Teeter, linguistics; George Wald, biology; Thomas H. Wilson, medical school; Marvin Winkler, biochemistry, and Daniel Wulff, biology.

College of the Holy Cross: William Van Eten Casey, theology; Thomas Coffee, sociology; John Dorenkamp, English; James Gross, economics; William Guindon, physics, and Paul Rosenkrantz, psychology.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Marcia K. Allen, biology; Maria Bade, biology; Eugene Bell, biology; Aron Bernstein, physics; P. Bon, modern languages; Michael Brower, management; Gene M. Brown, biochemistry; Joel E. Brown, biology; Stephen L. Chorover, psychology; Charles O. Coryell, chemistry; Richard M. Douglas, humanities; Carla Dowben, biology; Robert Dowben, biology; Maurice Fox, biology; Steven Gilborn, humanities; Marvin Goody, architecture; Glen Gordon, nuclear chemistry; Bernard Gould, biology; Charles Gross, psychology; Theodore Gurney, Jr., biology; Albert Gurney, humanities; Alan Hein, psychology; Richard Held, psychology; Charles Holt, biology; Kerson Huang, physics; Thomas Jackson, humanities; William Jackson, electrical engineering; Elizabeth Jones, biology; Karl Kornacker, biology; Edwin Kuh, management and economics; Cyrus Levinthal, biology; S. E. Luria, biology; Kevin Lynch, city planning; B. McCune, modern languages; Boris Magasanik, biology; Diane Major, biology; Travis Merritt, humanities; Franco Modigliani, economics; Philip Morrison, physics; Irwin Oppenheim, chemistry; R. B. Pan, modern languages; David Perlmutter, modern languages; Norman Pettit, humanities; Louis Pfeiffer, psychology; Helen Revel, biology; P. W. Robbins, biochemistry; Ronald Rolfe, biology; R. H. Ruby, biology; David L. Schalk, humanities; Robert Sekuler, psychology; David Shoemaker, chemistry; William Siebert, electrical engineering; O. R. Simha, administration; Malcolm Skolnick, physics; Cyril Smith, humanities and metallurgy; Marvin Stodolsky, biology; N. S. Sutherland, psychology; James Thomson, humanities; Patrick Wall, biology; William B. Watson, humanities; John S. Waugh, chemistry; Joseph Weizenbaum, electrical engineering; Burton White, psychology; Robert Zimmermann, biology; Arnulf Zweig, humanities, and Alexander Rich, biology.

University of Massachusetts: Don E. Abramson, speech; Robert Agard, library; Dean A. Allen, health services; Leon Barron, English; Phillip R. Biddle, speech; Milton Cantor, history; Jules Chametsky, English; Mario S. DePills, history; David Clark, English; T. P. Dikes, history; Louis A. Gelhard, history; Arthur Gentile, botany; F. Greeley, forestry; Richard Haven, English; Joseph Hazens, health services; Vincent Iardi, history; C. A. Johnson, agricultural engineering; Joseph Langland, English; David P. Leonard, history; Guenter Lewy, government; David Porter, English; William J. Price, speech; Howard H. Quint, history; Trevor Robinson, chemistry; Ann Sagan, history; Jay Savareid, speech; A. S. W. Sreffeay, forestry; Richard S. Stein, chemistry; Jack M.

Thompson, history; Richard H. Towers, history; Ronald D. Ware, history; J. W. Zahradnik, agricultural engineering; Arthur H. Westing, forestry.

Northeastern University: Richard Arnovitt, physics; Phillip Backstrom Jr., history; Terry Bialor, anthropology; Wallace Bishop, history; Roger Brighthill, psychology; Rose Laub Coser, sociology; Henry H. Crapo, mathematics; Alan H. Cromer, physics; Ellen H. Dunlap, mathematics; Marvin H. Friedman, physics; Mitzi Filson, library; Norbert Fullington, history; Michael J. Glaubman, physics; Stephan Golburgh, education; Joseph Gresser, chemistry; Barry Karger, chemistry; Frank Lee, anthropology; Milton Leitenberg, biology; Harold Naidus, chemistry; Dolores Newton, anthropology; Irene A. Nichols, education; J. David Oberholzer, physics; Louis Roberts, English; Fred Rosenberg, biology; Deborah S. Roseblatt, modern languages; Norman Rosenblatt, history; Eugene J. Saletan, physics; George Salzman, physics; Ina Samuels, psychology; Burt Scharf, psychology; Stan Stenbridge, history; Harold L. Stubbs, mathematics; H. T. Tien, chemistry; Harold Zamasky, psychology.

University of Rochester: Albert B. Craig, Jr., physiology; John A. Ernest, mathematics; Joseph Frank, English; William D. Lotspeich, physiology; William F. Neuman, radiation biology; Arnold W. Ravin, biology; Hayden V. White, history.

Simmons College: Frederick Anderson, philosophy; Tilden Edelstein, history; Bruce Hawthorne, history; John Hunter, history; Sumner Rosen, economics; James Newman, French; Georgia Noble, education; Richard Clark Sterne, English.

Smith College: Gladys Anslow, physics; Leonard Baskin, art; George Burt, music; Eli Chinoy, sociology; Jean Cohen, psychology; Louis Cohn-Haft, history; Thomas S. Deer, chaplain; John Duke, music; Robert Fabian, mathematics; Phillip Green, government; Bruce Hawkins, physics; David C. Huntington, art; Rita Jules, education; Alice Lazerowitz, philosophy; Morris Lazerowitz, philosophy; D. Bruce Marshall, government; Elliott Offner, art; Patricia Olmsted, administration; Harold Poor, history; Michael Rice, physics; Peter N. Rowe, government; Ramon Eduardo Ruiz, history; Paul H. Seton, psychology; J. Diedrick Snoek, psychology; A. H. Spees, physics; Melvin Steinberg, physics; Sten Stenson, religion; John Van Doren, English; Renee Watkins, history.

Tufts University: Betty Burch, government; Kalman A. Burnim, drama; Dean Ashley Campbell, engineering; Ernest Cassara, theology; John Conwall, economics; Dorothea J. Crook, psychology; Michael Fixler, English; Sanford J. Freedman, psychology; Bernard W. Harleston, psychology; Hilde Hein, philosophy; Percy Hill, engineering; Franklin D. Holzman, economics; Albert H. Imlah, history; David Isles, mathematics; William S. Jacobson, English; Leonard Kirsch, economics; Mary Jane Kramer, sociology; Zella Luria, psychology; Bernard McCabe, English; Robert L'H. Miller, religion; A. William Mills, psychology; Thornton Roby, psychology; Nancy L. Roelker, history; Laura M. Roth, physics; H. Ronald Rouse, mathematics; Allen Schick, government; Edwin Schur, sociology; Sylvia Sherwood, sociology; Newlin R. Smith, economics; Jack Tessman, physics; Frank W. Wicker, psychology.

Wellesley College: Roberta Blackburn, English; Thomas Blackburn, chemistry; Walter Houghton, English; Clifford Noll, English.

Wesleyan University: Samuel W. Anderson, psychology; James A. Carlo, psychology; Richard C. DeBold, psychology; David P. McAllester, anthropology; Norman Rudich, languages; Richard Winslow, music.

Others: Edgar D. Bell, Littleton; Arthur W. Chickering, Goddard College; Dorothy D. Carlo, Yale; Edward J. Collins, Boston College; Irvin Doress, Cardinal Cushing College;

Paul Gross, Brown University; Francis W. Holmes, Bernard Howard, Worcester Polytechnic Institute; Seymour Lederberg, Brown University; Raymond T. McNally, Boston College; David Todd, Worcester Polytechnic Institute; J. Huston Westover, Acton.

(Institutional affiliation for purposes of identification only.)

If you approve of this statement, reprint it in other newspapers and write or wire President Lyndon B. Johnson, White House, Washington, D.C.

This open letter is being published as an advertisement paid by the signers. Comments and contributions toward cost should be sent to Ad Hoc Committee for Open Letter on Vietnam, Post Office Box 35, Belmont, Mass., Prof. Salvador E. Luria, chairman; Prof. Cyrus Levinthal, treasurer.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

#### AN INCREDIBLE SITUATION

The Senate Democratic leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, is putting it mildly when he terms conditions in South Vietnam "an incredible situation." He says the squabbling generals should take notice that the United States is not committed to support the situation that now exists.

South Vietnam is pretty close to anarchy. Lt. Gen. Nguyen Khanh, the strong man for 13 months, was bounced over the weekend by a group of quarreling generals. The latest civilian government installed a few days ago by General Khanh is still nominally in power. But Khanh is out. So it seems almost irrelevant for Washington officials to say the United States is continuing full support of the civilian regime. What is to be supported?

The situation is going from worse to worse. The Communist-led Vietcong have now virtually cut South Vietnam in two and continue to make gains. U.S. troops are keeping the war going, but it is a losing struggle. The United States might have profited from its recent retaliatory air raids on North Vietnam by maneuvering for negotiations in the hope that it could seep from a strengthened position, but that potential initiative has been lost.

Instead, Washington dispatches say the administration is firmly resisting all efforts by Allied governments to bring about a negotiated political settlement. If this is so, it also is an incredible situation. The arguments of French Foreign Minister Maurice Couve de Murville, General de Gaulle's top foreign policy expert, apparently fell on deaf ears. Couve de Murville spent an hour with President Johnson last week; he reportedly told the Chief Executive he thinks North Vietnam and Red China would be interested in negotiations. He urged the United States to seek a political solution immediately.

This may be distasteful, but what is the alternative in the absence of a Saigon government ready, willing, and able to carry on? It would be comforting to think that the Americans, the Russians, and the Chinese do not mean precisely what they say, that somewhere in the diplomatic underground people are talking privately about public conferences. That would be a sensible and statesmanlike procedure; we only hope there is more to it than the stuff of dreams.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY,  
Boston, Mass.

Mr. MORSE,  
Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am a 22-year-old senior at Boston University. Although I am a New York State resident voter, I wish to applaud you for taking a stand in favor of peaceful negotiations in Vietnam.

I sincerely believe in working toward peace positively. I am very pleased the U.S. Government has created and is continuing the

Peace Corps. I also deeply believe in democracy and defending the United States and I am anxious to prevent communism from dominating the world. However, I am aware of the unique conditions under which the United States developed its political system. I am cognizant also of the fact many of the underdeveloped countries seem to need a socialistic form of government to cope with their basic problems such as hunger and land distribution. I do not equate socialism with Russian or Red Chinese communism necessarily. I believe that each country should develop the type of government which most successfully helps it grow.

I believe our foreign policy in South Vietnam has been and is being mishandled badly. It is as much a fault of Americans' indifference as it is of the Government. Our policy has been and is immoral. We are supporting a government which is supported by 30 percent of the South Vietnamese at the most. Even worse for us, we are working against a main goal in the cold war. By our current militant strategy, we are pushing Russia and Red China closer together and forcing North Vietnam closer to them.

In view of the rise of nationalism in the world and the fact the fighting in Vietnam began as a civil war, I am not certain that Red China would dare to militarily occupy Vietnam if we withdrew from South Vietnam.

It is basically for these reasons that I am in favor of peaceful negotiations in Vietnam. I gravely hope that the Government as a whole will have your courage and vision to recognize our errors and turn toward negotiation to settle the Vietnam crisis instead of edging the world further toward destruction.

To have any type of successful negotiations, it may well be necessary to include Red China. If it is, I would be in favor of such action.

I have also written to Senators KENNEDY and JAVRS and President Johnson, stating my beliefs.

Yours truly,

Mrs. NANCY MOORE.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Care of Illinois Institute of Technology,  
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SENATOR: The enclosed article on Vietnam and our actions there, appeared in a prominent Canadian magazine this week. In view of your great interest in the deplorable South Vietnam situation, I deemed it important enough to place in your hands. The author, a well-known RCAF officer and a former member of the International Control Commission would have little reason to magnify the situation but apparently has been able to publish in Canada, views which would be heavily censored in our country.

Whether we should remain in Vietnam or not, we are there and apparently making the same mistakes we did in Korea, only this time, we aren't supposed to be at war.

I feel confident that not only will this article furnish you with material you would want to have but that you will continue to force the issue with all the vigor so prevalent in your distinguished career.

Sincerely,

ROY B. NORDHEIMER.

HUGH CAMPBELL SAYS—THE AMERICANS ARE THEIR OWN WORST ENEMIES IN VIETNAM

The United States is now entering its third year of full-scale war in Vietnam. Any day now we can expect the customary New Year pronouncement from the American high command in Saigon to the effect that, while the situation is serious, it is not hopeless; and that the war can and will be won.

After nearly 2 years in Vietnam, I've heard a good many such assurances. But since, as a Canadian delegate on the three-nation International Control Commission, I had a

unique opportunity to observe the war from both sides of the firing line, I think the Americans are talking through their well padded brass hats. The war, as it's now being waged, cannot be won by our side—because the Americans, for all their brave talk about developing new antiguerrilla techniques, are still using obsolete methods to fight a new kind of invisible enemy.

Exactly how invisible this enemy—the Communist Vietcong—can become was forcibly demonstrated to me one day on a dusty gravel road leading through the jungle in North Vietnam. It was a routine inspection patrol for the International Control Commission and, for no apparent reason, the Communist officer in the lead jeep suddenly suggested a halt. We piled out of our jeeps and stretched our legs, apparently in the middle of nowhere. Just as inexplicably, he then suggested we resume the patrol. As the convoy started off, he beeped his horn and, somewhere nearby, a whistle shrieked.

Instantly, both sides of the road were lined with troops, grinning infantrymen whose faded khaki uniforms contrasted sharply with the dark jungle background. They'd been there all the while, standing not a dozen yards from the convoy. But because of the foliage that covered their backs from helmet to canvas sneakers, they'd been invisible to three experienced military officers.

There was nothing threatening about this mock ambush. The Communist troops were simply practicing camouflage, and used the International Control Commission as an unwitting umpire. And although their camouflage was excellent, it was the mobility of the troops that impressed me most. They were many miles from any known base, and they carried on their backs everything necessary for living and fighting. They didn't need roads, jeeps, helicopters, or mobile kitchens. They were jungle fighters, as elusive as poison gas and twice as deadly—the kind of guerrillas who wore down the French masters of Indochina, and finished them off at Dien-bienphu in 1954.

The Pentagon, naturally, has been determined not to repeat France's mistakes. In the past 3 years they've poured in aid and advisers at the rate of more than a million dollars a day. So generous, so overwhelming has been this avalanche of assistance, that it's aided South Vietnam almost to death.

In 1962, there were fewer than 300 U.S. military advisers in the country—and they were making noticeable headway against the Vietcong. The advisers were scattered in tiny detachments around the country. They were tough, highly trained men, and they were revered by the Vietnamese.

But the Pentagon apparently reasoned that 20,000 advisers could win the war 20 times as fast as 300; they started airlifting them into Saigon by the thousands (in defiance, incidentally, of the Geneva truce agreement). With them came wives, children, PX supermarkets, Coca-Cola machines, air conditioners, officers' clubs, station wagons, insurance salesmen, schoolteachers, public relations men—all the equipment of a progressive suburb, without which the American military seems unable to function abroad. Suddenly, it stopped being a jungle war, with Americans fighting on the same terms as their enemies. It became instead a desk-soldiers' war, with the fatuities of Saigon's brass hats canceling the efforts of the men in the field. A gap appeared between the South Vietnamese and their American protectors, and the gap has been widening ever since.

There's also a gap between the Pentagon's concept of mobility and that of the guerrillas. Putting troops on wheels or in helicopters has proven unrealistic in a jungle war. Disguised as peasants, the Vietcong simply watch the machines charge futilely by—perhaps into a mine trap or ambush or, if they're detected, simply melt into the

jungle. Pursuit on foot is fruitless; the South Vietnamese troops, carrying enough American-made equipment to fight the Battle of the Bulge, would be ineffective even if they were as hardy as their enemy. But of course they aren't, since they're now accustomed to riding to work.

But all the mistakes haven't been committed by the military. There are a host of non-military agencies fighting Saigon's war, from the spooks of the CIA to the flacks of the U.S. Information Agency. They frequently operate at cross-purposes and, in general, it may be said that they do not enhance America's image abroad.

Take, for instance, the unimportant but revealing case of the American pro football player who arrived in Saigon under State Department auspices to set up an athletic program for the Vietnamese. "Gonna teach these gooks football," he announced to all within earshot. Several days later, he announced a change in policy: the gooks, he'd decided, were too small for football—so he was going to teach them soccer, a game he'd never played himself.

Or take the average American service wife in Saigon: for boorishness, offensiveness and condescension toward her inferiors, she takes the fur-lined mug. The generous allowances, PX privileges, villa, chauffeur and servants are all new to her—and with rare exceptions, it shows. Her kids are no better. The spectacle of a bunch of crew-cutted, gum-chewing teenagers lording it over the natives in the streets of Saigon is a lesson in how not to conduct foreign relations.

Or, finally, take the matter of Saigon's justly famous night life, which consists of scores of saloons, each equipped with a bevy of the prettiest little bar girls in southeast Asia. The patrons are almost exclusively American; and one South Vietnamese woman, who owns a string of such establishments, told me she estimates that half her girls are actively pro-Vietcong, while the rest maintain a profitable neutrality by spying impartially for both sides. Multiply this example by a hundred, and you have an effective intelligence network—and an explanation for the failure of so many well-planned, secret sorties against the Vietcong.

The result of all this ugly Americanism has been exactly what you'd expect: the South Vietnamese is starting to wonder if his Communist enemies might not be preferable to his American friends. Once he publicly mourned the loss of American lives. Now, the nearly 300 Americans killed in Vietnam seem meaningless compared with his own terrible losses—more than 160,000 dead. Once he believed that his Government, good or bad, would be free of foreign interference. Now he's convinced that his Government—whatever assortment of generals happens to be in power at the moment—is a puppet of the Pentagon. And every time a big American car zips by him on the streets of Saigon; every time he enters a restaurant he can no longer afford; every time he returns to his shabby dwelling (the Americans have grabbed all the best accommodations); he sees himself moving closer and closer to second-class citizenship.

If the foregoing sounds like an anti-American tirade, it's not intentional. There are still hundreds of smart, dedicated, and effective Americans in Vietnam. They want to win this tragic war and, through a firsthand acquaintance with the realities of guerrilla warfare, they think they know how to do it. Unfortunately, they're only fighting the war, not running it. And they're vastly outnumbered and outranked by the desk-pilots in Saigon.

For this reason, the Communists are almost certain to nibble their way to victory eventually. When they do, it will be a disaster for the West. For all my reservations about life in the Saigon sector of the free world, I'm convinced, after seeing both



NEW YORK, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As I read Hanson Baldwin's article in the New York Times Magazine section yesterday, I became filled with terror. Can our country be so arrogant, so reckless as to risk total war over Vietnam, an area in which we have no business entrenching ourselves, and where we are hated by the overwhelming majority of the people?

I applaud your courage in speaking out, almost alone in the Senate, and I want you to know that many people are behind you.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. CLAUDIA ZASLAVSKY.

OAKLAND, N.J.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I support you 100 percent in your opposition to our presence in Vietnam. Please keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

NELLE K. MORAN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: You are fighting for all the men in U.S. forces in southeast Asia and for the people there and for us here.

We believe that you will not give up no matter what the administration may do.

Thanking you very truly,

ARTHUR AND HELEN BERTHOLF.

VENICE, CALIF.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your courage and integrity in becoming the spokesman for an unpopular view regarding our policy in Vietnam is sincerely appreciated.

We strongly oppose bombing of North Vietnamese supply lines or extending the war in Vietnam.

We urge you to continue to do all in your power to bring about immediate negotiation.

Yours truly,

Mrs. MARILYN HORN.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We commend you on your forthright position in demanding U.S. withdrawal and negotiations in South Vietnam. We have written letters to President Johnson and to our congressional delegation to do likewise.

We need more representatives like you in Congress.

Sincerely,

SARA ALCHERMES.

ERNEST J. ALCHERMES.

SALEM, OREG.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing in regard to the situation in Vietnam. I understand how you feel in regard to this. Before more pressure builds up to attack the North, vigorous efforts should be made to negotiate an end to the war. The U.N. should have a vital role in this. What South Vietnam needs is an internationally supported program to establish stable government. We all know this, but how to accomplish it is the problem.

Sincerely,

ELLA B. BRADFORD.

NARRAGANSETT, R.I.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep up the good work re South Vietnam.

FRANK G. WIENER.

SANTA CRUZ, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are solidly back of your efforts to persuade the U.S. Government to try to negotiate an end to the war in Indochina.

If negotiations should fail, we should not under any circumstances commit a larger land army to the mainland of Asia. In the long run it would be a trap and sure suicide for thousands of our men, if we tried to beat the unlimited manpower of China on the ground.

China entered Korea when she was much weaker, and the present government had been in power only 3 years.

If we invade to the north, I believe China would enter an unlimited number of soldiers to stop us, and her millions could not be stopped.

We are a great sea and air power, and I believe we could hold the Pacific and the islands now in our possession indefinitely. Let's withdraw from the mainland now, while it is possible.

Please continue your efforts.

Yours truly,

GEORGE M. GATES.

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,  
U.S. Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In the last 2 weeks I have sent a pair of wires to President Johnson and a letter to each of the Ohio Senators. In these messages I deplored escalation of the conflict in Vietnam and urged our immediate withdrawal. In any event, I want those who have spoken up for disengagement in Vietnam to know that their views are not without some support among the citizens of Ohio.

If it was not apparent previously, the events of this weekend, which found our South Vietnamese allies turning the weapons we supplied them against each other, surely prove beyond any doubt that defense of South Vietnam is impossible (short of establishing a government of occupation and committing all of our resources). And though loss of South Vietnam would be regrettable, isn't this inevitable in any event? We cannot hope to win a land war in Asia, should China become a participant, and surely not even the administration is prepared to make good upon that eventuality. This means that all of Vietnam must ultimately come under the influence of her powerful neighbor. And deplore this as we must, it is foolhardy to commit our prestige and the lives of our citizens in a quixotic adventure bound to end in failure.

My main concern, however, is not for our prestige. What I fear most immediately is that increasingly reckless actions growing out of a hopeless situation will plunge the world into nuclear war. By our rash attacks of 2 weeks ago we entered upon a course which if continued can only lead to the entrance of China and the Soviet Union, and at last—unless God should intervene—the final world war.

I love my country and I value the peace of the world too much to keep silent at such a time. Nothing, no cause, no principle—certainly nothing so insubstantial as prestige, can ever justify risking the destruction of America in nuclear war. And though tough talk may appeal to some of our countrymen, there will be only curses—and no applause, on that day of doom that brings the bomb to the United States.

The President is playing Russian roulette with American security. I urge you to do everything in your power to end this deadly

game, calling for the sane and reasonable conduct of our foreign policy in a very dangerous world.

Most sincerely,

PAUL G. SCHMIDT.

BERKELEY, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I urge you to work for a peaceful, negotiated settlement in Vietnam and to oppose a continuation or an escalation of this fruitless conflict. We are indeed losing this war, not because of intervention by North Vietnam but because the Vietcong, a basically indigenous movement, has the support of the South Vietnamese people. In a situation which called for political and economic measures, we chose to rely on military force.

The disastrous results of this policy are now obvious. We cannot win this war. Escalation only leads to the prospect of a larger war in Asia with North Vietnam and possibly China; this larger conflict in turn would probably lead to a general nuclear war. The situation demands a peaceful settlement; the American people want a peaceful settlement, not a larger war. Therefore I urge you to continue to speak out and to express your dissatisfaction with our present policy. We must begin negotiations now with all interested parties to work for a peaceful and neutralized Vietnam. There is no alternative to a negotiated settlement except a general war.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM B. CORT.

DEAR SIR: My name is Mrs. Jo Ann Heltsley of 496 Brittain Road, Akron, Ohio.

I was listening to the news this evening and heard a portion of the speech you made concerning the United States and Vietnam. I have heard many speeches concerning Vietnam but you seemed to be just about the only one who feels as I do.

I have a special interest in Vietnam due to losing my husband there.

His name was Pfc. Paul R. Heltsley, III, RA-15675814, the first Akron area serviceman to die in Vietnam. He was killed July 17, 1964, while accompanying a patrol as a medic on a combat mission.

I guess I'll never understand the Vietnam problem. In the telegram I received from the War Department it said he was killed by hostile action while on a combat mission. I also have received many letters from servicemen in Vietnam concerning my husband's death, or should I say murder. Even President Johnson wrote me telling me my husband died while performing duties for his country.

I wrote President Johnson shortly after receiving his letter asking him some questions. As I told him, I have a baby girl who will never know her father. Some day I'm going to have to explain his death to her. How can I possibly explain something I don't understand?

Before my husband's death he wrote many letters concerning Vietnam. How the people wouldn't fight for themselves, how his buddies were getting killed each day, and how he wanted to come home safely.

It seems like all President Johnson can say is, "Be proud of him, as we are, he died for something we as Americans believe in."

I don't feel Johnson or anyone can know how helpless we are in Vietnam until you lose someone there. I'm not only speaking for myself, but for the other American people who have lost sons, husbands, and fathers in this so-called undeclared war.

Before my husband left the United States he told me he would receive hazard-duty pay, also \$10,000 insurance in case of death. This proved to be untrue. I guess the Gov-

ernment doesn't feel he was in the danger zone. If this is true I'd like to know why he was in the combat zone. I've also been told that there is no insurance on the men unless the United States declares war.

I can't understand why our men are giving their lives in a war that isn't a war. Maybe someday I'll be able to explain to my daughter the truth about Vietnam, if it's ever brought out in the open. I just wanted you to know that there's an awful lot of good Americans who feel the same way about Vietnam as you do.

May God bless you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JO ANN HELTSLEY.

IDAHO PARK, OREG.

WAYNE MORSE,  
Oregon State Senator,  
Eugene, Oreg.

DEAR SIR: I wish to go on record that I desire a cease fire in Vietnam and a negotiated settlement.

I know what your personal opinion on this matter has always been, and I admire you for speaking out. Some of the rest of us wish to speak out also.

On the radio news this morning I heard this statement made by Senator CHURCH, of Idaho, then the commentator added that much of the mail voicing this opinion would be "Communist inspired."

I wish to state that I am most certainly not "Communist inspired," and I know many people who hold this opinion who are not.

Sincerely,

Mrs. HELEN DAVIS.

[From the New York Times]

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON ON  
VIETNAM: LET US TAKE THE INITIATIVE

Each day we hear fresh news from Vietnam, news both strange and grim. We strike by air in reprisal against North Vietnam because our soldiers, sent as armed technicians and advisers to an army which cannot yet guard them well, have been attacked in their barracks in the very heart of South Vietnam. We have widened the war—how wide will it become?

Fear of escalation of this undeclared war against North Vietnam mounts with each sudden report of renewed violence. Unless the situation is very different from what it appears to be, we have lost the political initiative in Vietnam and are attempting to substitute military actions for political ones. We face grave risks in Vietnam. Americans have faced even graver risks for good and high cause, Mr. President, but we must first understand why we must take such risks. What are our goals in Vietnam? Are they just? Can they be accomplished? Are they truly worth what they are bound to cost in dollars and human lives?

With whom are we allied in Vietnam? Are our soldiers fighting side-by-side with troops of a representative and legitimate national government, or are we embroiled in defense of an unpopular minority in a fierce and costly civil war? Our representatives assure us that we and the Saigon government have the overwhelming support of the Vietnamese people. How can this be so? On the same day that Mr. McNamara said sneak attacks upon our soldiers cannot be prevented, an American officer on the scene in Vietnam declared that "any of the people in the hamlet over there could have warned us that the Vietcong were around, but they did not warn us." The weapons used against us are most often American weapons, captured from or surrendered by the South Vietnamese Army. Mr. President, we submit that weak field intelligence in South Vietnam and a steady loss of workable weapons to the enemy, are deep symptoms of an unpopular cause.

Why are we fighting in Vietnam? Mr. President, we think we understand why we went into Vietnam after the French withdrew. It was because this Nation hoped to encourage the development of a popular, stable, and democratic government which would help to lead all southeast Asia toward lasting peace. Historical, political, social, religious and sectional factors have prevented this development. The original assumptions are no longer valid. We have become increasingly unwelcome everywhere in southeast Asia. Our presence seems to deepen, rather than to relieve, the bitterness and hostility of the people. It was only 10 years ago that the Vietnamese defeated a French army of nearly half a million men. Will the same battles occur again?

Can we win in Vietnam? Mr. President, we know that our Nation has sufficient firepower to destroy the entire world. We also know that you do not wish to call upon this awesome power. How can we possibly win and yet prevent a widening of this conflict? How can we win in Vietnam with less than 30,000 "advisers" when the French could not win with an army of nearly half a million fighting both north and south of the present dividing frontier?

Is it worth the cost? The French defeat in Indochina cost them 172,000 casualties. Yet, before their final bloody defeat at Dien Bienphu, the French generals and diplomats spoke with the same toughness and optimism, the same assurances we now hear from our leaders.

The French had overwhelming numbers and firepower but they lost in Vietnam because they lacked the support of the population. Do we face the same prospect, or are there facts which the public does not know which show our situation to be clearly different?

Mr. President, we are aware that you have secret information which cannot be shared with us. But could such information completely refute the picture of events and the political insights provided to us by serious newspapermen who have been in the area for years?

All we can see is a seemingly endless series of demonstrations and riots in Saigon and Hue, of military coups, of threats and challenges to the dignity of our Ambassador and our other representatives by the very men we seek to sustain in power.

We have lost the initiative in Vietnam. A few guerrillas can trigger American reactions that widen the war. The events of the past week are leading step by step along the path to war with China.

Would it not be both prudent and just to take the initiative toward peace in Vietnam? If we are not to widen the war beyond all conscience, as reasonable men we must initiate negotiations while there is still time.

Amherst College: Henry Commager, history; Van R. Halsey, administration; William M. Hexter, biology; Philip T. Ives, biology; Allen Kropf, chemistry; Edward R. Leadbetter, biology; Leo Marx, English; John Pemberton, religion; Oscar E. Schotte, biology; Marc Silver, chemistry; Henry T. Yost, biology.

Andover-Newton Theological College: Wesner Fallaw, religion; Nels F. S. Ferre, theology; Norman K. Gottwald, Old Testament; John C. Scammon, Old Testament.

Bates College: Leland Bechtel, education; Walter Boyce, administration; Robert M. Chute, biology; Robert Hatch, health; George Healy, Peter Jonitis, sociology; Robert Peck, health; Richard Sampson, mathematics; Richard Warye, speech.

Boston University: George D. W. Berry, philosophy; Bernard Chasan, physics; Joseph Cochran, pharmacology; Robert S. Cohen, physics; Paul K. Deats, Jr., theology; Alvin

Fiering, film; George Hein, chemistry; Carol Kaye, psychiatry; Conan Kornetsky, pharmacology; John H. Lavelly, philosophy; Allan F. Mirsky, psychiatry; Bernard S. Phillips, sociology; Freda Reblsky, psychology; Melvin Rosenthal, psychiatry; Julius A. Roth, sociology; Nancy St. John, basic studies; Armand Siegel, physics; Robert H. Sproat, English; John J. Stachel, physics; Gerald Stechler, psychiatry; Max W. Wartofsky, philosophy; Charles E. Willis, physics; Alvin D. Zalinger, sociology; Howard Zinn, government.

Bowdoin College: Philip M. Brown, economics; Thomas Cornell, art; Luis O. Coxé, engineering; Clarence Davies, government; John C. Donovan, government; Reginald Hannaford, English; Ernst C. Helmreich, history; Gordon Hiebert, chemistry; John Howland, biology; Charles E. Huntington, biology; Gerald Kamber, French; Fritz C. A. Kollin, German; Albert Nunn, French; Marvin Sadik, art; James A. Storer, economics; William B. Whiteside, history.

Brandeis University: Rose Abendstren, languages; Herbert H. Attekar, sociology; Max Chretien, physics; Saul Cohen, chemistry; Lewis A. Coser, sociology; George L. Cowgill, anthropology; Herman T. Epstein, biology; Jerrold Fassman, biochemistry; Kenneth B. Feigenbaum, psychology; Gordon A. Fellman, sociology; David H. Fischer, history; Lawrence Fuchs, history; David G. Gil, sociology; Ray Ginger, history; Jack Goldstein, physics; Theodore Goodfriend, biochemistry; Stephen J. Grendzier, languages; Mary E. Griffin, English; Eugene Gross, physics; Allan Grossman, English; Lawrence Grossman, biochemistry; Lincoln D. Hammond, languages; Thomas C. Hollocher, biochemistry; Mary Ellen Jones, biochemistry; David Kaplan, anthropology; Nathan Kaplan, biochemistry; Attila O. Klein, biology; Laurence Levine, biochemistry; Henry Linschitz, biochemistry; Alvin Lucier, music; Robert Manners, anthropology; Herbert Marcuse, philosophy; William Murakami, biochemistry; Joseph F. Murphy, politics; Robert O. Preyer, English; Murray Sachs, languages; Benson Saler, anthropology; Gordon Sato, biochemistry; Sylvan Schweber, physics; Philip E. Slater, sociology; B. Z. Sobel, sociology; Morris Soodak, biochemistry; Mark Spivak, sociology; Maurice Stein, sociology; Maurice Sussman, biology; Helen Van Vunakis, biochemistry; John Vickers, philosophy; E. V. Walter, sociology; Roland L. Warren, sociology; Alex Weingrod, anthropology; Harold Welsberg, philosophy; Robert S. Weiss, sociology; John Wight, engineering; Kurt H. Wolff, sociology; Irving K. Zola, sociology.

Clark University: J. Richard Reid, languages; Morton Wiener, psychology; Charles Beinderman, English; Abraham Blum, psychology; Walter H. Crockett, psychology; Bernard Kaplan, psychology, and Philip G. Olson, sociology.

Harvard University: Harold Amos, medical school; French Anderson, medical school; Ralph Balerlein, physics; Guy O. Barnett, medicine; Reuben Brower, English; Lawrence Burkholder, divinity; Ian Cooke, biology; Frank Moore Cross, Jr., languages; R. Damadian, medical school; Bernard D. Davis, medical school; David Denhardt, biology; E. S. Dethlefsen, biology; Donald T. Dubin, medical school; Michael T. Dubin, medical school; Michael Eddin, medical school; John Edsell, biology; Leon Ehrenpreis, mathematics; Rupert Emerson, government; Ann Farnham, medical school; John Feinstein, English; Donald Fleming, history; A. S. Freedberg, medical school; Walter Gilbert, physics; Philip Gold, chemistry; Irving H. Goldberg, medical school; Luigi Gorini, medical school; David Cavers, law; Howard H. Hiatt, medical school; H. Stuart Hughes, history; Stanley Katz, history; Gordon D. Kaufman, theology; Eugene P. Kennedy, medical school; John

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You have restored again my faith in democracy. Enclosed is a copy of my letter to the President in support of your position on South Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

R. DIDCHENKO.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
President of the United States,  
White House, Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: I take it upon myself, as a concerned citizen and your supporter, to urge you that you heed the warnings of Senator Morse and others regarding our policies in South Vietnam.

The honor of a great nation does not require from her leaders to sacrifice the lives of her people rather than admit a past mistake in policy. Our involvement in South Vietnam was a mistake. Let us have wisdom and courage to admit it.

Respectfully yours,

R. DIDCHENKO, Ph. D.

MEDFORD, OREG.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For several months I have been intending to write and thank you for your stand on one great, current issue—our involvement in Vietnam. I thank you. I admire you for your suggestion that we submit the issue to the United Nations. I want to add my bit of support for your efforts.

Of course, I have excuses for not writing you before this. But they are not good excuses. With the current escalation of our military actions in Vietnam and the ever-increasing visibility of our Government's untruthful news releases and stubborn persistence in the same shameful rut, I could no longer delay writing you without violating my conscience further.

I wish sincerely that the current administration would struggle to come up with as visionary ideas for our responsibilities to the poverty stricken and politically repressed people of Vietnam and other nations as they have for such people in our own country.

As long as I have pen in hand I do want to relate another somewhat narrower but, I believe, important concern. That is the VA intention to close a number of their hospital and domiciliaries including the nearby one at White City. If one grants the VA's apparently clear assumption that their responsibility is only for acute medical treatment for veterans it is difficult to refute the logic of their action. Even if one agrees with that assumption, however, I think that one could argue that building new and larger hospitals in the big cities in conjunction with medical schools sometimes results in admissions being based on what do we want to teach the medical student next, rather than on what medical services do the veterans need. In any event I see reasons to argue with their basic assumptions. To point out only one—the domiciliaries were set up as homes, not as hospitals. They were set up to meet a social need of disabled and underprivileged veterans. The Great Society has not yet arrived—there are inadequate economic and social supports for these veterans and the domiciliaries are still providing an essential service to this segment of our poverty stricken society. Whether or not hospitals are associated with these domiciliaries is therefore beside the point.

If the VA is bound and determined to get out of the homes service, I would at least

hope that Congress would pressure them to phase out the domiciliaries over a period of time—so that individual planning for the provision of alternative services could be provided for some of these veterans—rather than shipping them en masse from their own communities to distant parts of the country.

Yours truly,

ROBERT R. GORRKE.

PRINCETON, N.J.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to commend your opposition to our policy in Vietnam. It takes a great deal of courage to stand against such emotion-laden policies. You have my admiration and unqualified support in your efforts to do so.

The basic trouble in our foreign policy is that it is a holding action designed to preserve the world status quo. But the status quo is an abominable mess. We need a positive policy aimed at accelerating political, economic, and social reforms.

If you will excuse me for departing from the realm of the practical, for my own satisfaction I would like to suggest that the basic planks in our foreign policy should be the following:

1. A massive worldwide program for birth control.
2. The establishment or improvement of public health programs. Most people live at the mercy of disease.
3. A program of agricultural reform and industrial expansion, backed by the kind of money we put into war.
4. The development of education on a worldwide basis. Only in education can we hope to improve men's thinking.
5. Forceful support of movements to establish social justice, which we too often oppose.
6. The encouragement of democratic institutions. Only on this point is even our thinking straight. But I do not think we do much to implement it.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. BOWEN.

ELSINORE, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please permit me to tell you that my family and I fully support your stand on Vietnam.

No good, decent person wants the escalation of this useless terrible war. It can only end in a holocaust for the world and what will remain will not be democracy, therefore it must be stopped now.

Wishing you good health and happiness and thank you for your fine leadership.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. NINA HAMMER.

DEAR SIR: In light of the recent events in Vietnam, the Swarthmore Student Council presented the enclosed resolution to referendum to the Swarthmore student body on February 18, 1965. The resolution passed by a vote of 370 to 255, with about 60 percent of the student body voting.

Sincerely yours,

ANN B. MOSELY,  
President, Swarthmore Student Council.

#### RESOLUTION ON VIETNAM

On the basis of publicly available information concerning the situation in Vietnam, we believe that with each passing week, the situation there poses an increasing threat to world peace. We view with great fear any new military action which would further heighten the danger of escalating the con-

flict. For this reason we strongly protest the recent air strikes against North Vietnam.

Further, we believe that:

1. U.S. attacks on North Vietnam not only violate international law but also increase the possibility of Chinese intervention in the undeclared war.

2. U.S. support of the Khanh regime in South Vietnam is unwarranted on our Government's stated grounds of support for freedom and democracy. It is apparent to all that the Khanh regime lacks the backing of the South Vietnamese people.

3. Military tactics used by the United States in South Vietnam such as defoliation (which destroys crops as well as revealing guerrilla hideouts) and strategic hamlets (which involve the forced eviction of families from their villages) have not been effective and are deplorable on humanitarian grounds.

4. Our Government has failed in its duty to supply the American people with full information on its policies and actions in Vietnam.

We conclude that the use of brinkmanship policies in the grave situation in Vietnam could escalate the war from an internal conflict to a broader struggle. We therefore support a negotiated peace settlement and withdrawal of American military forces from South Vietnam.

NORTH BEND, OREG.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Get us out of Vietnam. Let's not worry about dignity—just get out.

We never should have been there, and it won't hurt us as a nation, to admit a mistake.

With your position in the Senate, your knowledge, and your following, you should be able to throw a lot of weight around.

Sincerely yours,

ROSCOE B. HAZER.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I express my appreciation for your position regarding our country's illegal and dangerous intervention in Vietnam? Your Denver speech was a masterpiece of logic and intelligent patriotism. Most people seem to be either confused or to feel that it is useless for a citizen to voice an opinion that is contrary to Government policy.

I heard part of a quotation from your remarks regarding our recent bombing of North Vietnam on the radio during the night, but it was never repeated, and I have been unable to find any mention of it in the daily press.

I would appreciate receiving any of your speeches or remarks since your Denver address on December 11, 1964. If possible, I would like to receive any of your future remarks on the above subject without making a separate request on each occasion.

Yours very truly,

MARK FISHER.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am so appalled at the undoubted signs our Government has chosen war. Is there nothing to be done? Who is advising the President in such a disastrous course?

I have just read a dreadful article by Hanson Baldwin which I feel is the Government point of view, in the Sunday Times, which must be answered point by point. I do hope you will do this.

I am so grateful to you and the other Senators—GRUENING, CHURCH, and so on—for your positions on this dangerous situation.

It would be possibly of great importance for you all to answer Hanson Baldwin's shocking article.

Very gratefully,

PHYLLIS BYRNE COX.

ST. HELENS, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR: Please use your influence and vote to get a social security medicare bill.

We would like repeal of section 14B, Taft-Hartley Act.

We like your stand on the Vietnamese question.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. CARL KOHLSTRAND.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Deep gratitude to you for standing firm for negotiations. Keep up the fight.

ELIZABETH MOOS.

BANDON, OREG.

HON. WAYNE B. MORSE,  
Senator from Oregon,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: This is to let you know the thoughts and wishes of Mrs. Burris and myself relative to the handling of this country's foreign affairs.

We agree with you that the United States should get out of South Vietnam at once and quit this foolish waste of American lives and resources. France saw the futility of the situation and wisely went home. Such a withdrawal at this time would not mean defeat but if we continue on our present course it can lead only to total war on the Chinese mainland.

We also heartily agree with Dan Smoot that we should abandon Africa completely and withdraw all forms of aid from countries that don't want or don't appreciate it. This country has been dissipating its resources all over the world for many years, surely to the delight of the Communists, while our national debt continues to grow out of control. It is not enough to simply balance the budget, which this country has not done for a long time. It is mandatory that we start to reduce the national debt at once. If we are unable to do so now, when the President reports our national economy is at an all-time high, then we had better give up. We cannot spend our way into prosperity at home, or in city, State or Federal governments.

It is our hope that you use your full power toward getting this country out of all its foolish commitments around the world. Let us discontinue all of our silly giveaway programs and adopt a get-tough policy. Conserve our resources, strengthen our country and reduce our national debt, and all countries will have to respect us. There is no reason why we should be openly insulted and scorned by such petty nations as Cuba, Panama, Africa, and others too numerous to mention, while we continue to pour more money into those same countries than they ever saw. We should take every penny away from them and see how much the Communists want them then. Then get us out of the United Nations. We are footing practically the entire bill and it is unable to accomplish a thing. Their intentions were of the best but they just won't work.

We thank you for the fine stand you are taking in these matters, and also for your kindness in looking out for the welfare of retired Federal civil service employees. May we be fortunate in having you as our Senator for many years.

Respectfully yours,

HAROLD T. BURRIS.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: In reference to the Vietnam situation, I would appreciate if I could be advised on what particular legislation the President is carrying on the so-called house-keeping operations in South Vietnam. I am particularly interested in the matter since the Constitution of the United States declares that Congress has the responsibility of declaring war. Is there any particular legislation which has delegated this responsibility to the President under certain conditions of limited warfare. It is a distressing situation. Our failure to adhere to our own Constitution and also fundamental principles of international law is keeping us in a state of turmoil. I would like more enlightenment on the subject.

Sincerely,

DONALD C. WALKER.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: This letter that I am writing may not do much good, for perhaps I am one in a million that would attempt to write their opinion of the things that are prevailing of today which are very wrong, and to my way of thinking, could be curtailed if the heads of our Government would really try to solve these problems now. They say what they will do, but I fail to see action. Perhaps the medicare will not go through for some time, maybe never, but if they would increase the lower bracket social security, people then could perhaps afford their own medical aid. But, how could I as one of many situated the same as I, and I am widowed with \$85 coming in a month. Impossible to do anything with that amount, and this excise tax was to be taken off too—I fail to see that in effect. I think it wrong that social security people should have to pay it. Many people think as I do and I think you will approve too, that Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense said, and I quote—that: "The Vietnam crisis is grave, but by no means hopeless," and expressed doubt the Chinese would step in with a major attack. It's obvious they would. I think he should be removed and many more think the same for if he is left in charge we will surely be involved. We're sitting on a bomb right now, and I don't think the people realize the grave situation we are in. I have a son that was in the World War and a Pearl Harbor survivor, and I have four grandsons and I'm certainly sure I wouldn't like to see them and many more of our young men involved in another war. So I think they had better get busy and down to earth with some way of solving this serious situation that is hanging over us. I know you have great influence and on these people the masses of people are surely depending for peace and prosperity and to help our own people first.

Sincerely,

Mrs. BEATRICE GERRANS.

BEAVERTON, OREG.

HON. WAYNE MORRIS,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This letter is written to let you know what my opinions and feelings are concerning some of the matters which are before Congress at the present time.

First, may I say that I'm in agreement with you in regards to the Vietnam problem.

Second, my opinion on Federal aid to schools; well and good if confined to public schools. Private schools and institutions receive enough aid as it is by being tax exempt in many ways. As a church member I believe their business property, investments, and holdings should be taxed. If people think enough of their churches they will

PORTLAND, OREG.

support them. Let church and state remain separated as our wise forefathers intended.

Third, that of foreign aid: It seems to me that a lot of our money has been wasted on those countries that show no appreciation. Why keep trying to buy friendship and respect? We've given away billions—in return for what? Those countries that received most—Egypt, France, etc.—where's the appreciation? They speak for themselves—"Go jump in the ocean," and even now France wants our gold, why can't she apply some of those dollars she has to repay our loan. Yet we still believe that we can buy friendship? Let us cut down on foreign aid and use some of that money in our own country and loan only to those countries that appreciate our aid like little Finland. Please tell Congress to use discretion with our (tax) dollars.

Thank you for listening.

Yours truly,

N. C. THOMPSON.

EUGENE, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am a Reed College graduate (1961) and a graduate student at the School of Music at the University of Oregon. You have my constant support and affection for your work in the Senate. I consider your stand on Vietnam a really courageous act. Is there any chance we can get out of there?

I feel so terribly uninformed about Vietnam—where can I find out what is really going on?

With respect,

JON APPLETON.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate of the United States  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is just a short note to voice my admiration of your long and hard battle against our involvement in South Vietnam. Developments in that area of the world certainly point to the correctness of your views. I hope you will continue your fight for reason—particularly for the involvement of the U.N.—in the Vietnam problem.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM WOLFERT.

LANDENBERG, PA.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is just to let you know that I am fully in agreement with your opposition to our further involvement in Vietnam.

Why not let the U.N. give it a try as U Thant has suggested?

Sincerely yours,

V. WEINMAYR.

OLMSTEAD FALLS, OHIO.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard over the radio the talk you gave at the City Club in Cleveland, Friday, February 19.

We thought your talk an excellent one and wished every city in our country could have heard the talk and the questions after your speech which you answered very well.

If the people of our country could hear the truth about Vietnam as you gave it in your talk to the City Club, the administration's actions in Vietnam would be ended soon; immediately.

I would like to have a copy of this talk. If you have many copies, please send me several. We can get it reproduced in Cleveland and distribute several hundred copies.

Thank you very much for giving the truth to the American people.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. VIVIAN WILSON.



out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

The pressures on this country to seek a negotiated settlement of the Vietnamese conflict are approaching a point where the United States is being isolated. In recent days Russia has joined France in appealing for talks; the British would like to see negotiations started; the news from North Vietnam hints at a desire to confer; India had previously expressed the same wish, and yesterday Secretary General Thant of the United Nations disclosed that he has been engaged in discussions with the United States and other involved nations and has made "concrete proposals" for a negotiated settlement.

Washington, to be sure, is not quite alone. Communist China has been adamant against negotiations and it is quite possible that Peking will refuse to talk. However, Mr. Thant, President de Gaulle and the Russians believe that China can be induced to join a reconvened meeting of the 14-nation Geneva conference.

Yesterday it was announced that American jet bombers, with Americans manning the weapons as well as the controls, are now fighting in Vietnam. Their involvement makes Americans open combatants in the war, not just "advisers"; thus the conflict has again been escalated. Correspondents in Washington are being informed that United States policy now permits attacks on North Vietnam even without further provocations. The point of no return on a wider war may be at hand.

A State Department spokesman goes on repeating that the United States will reject negotiations so long as Hanoi supports the Vietcong guerrillas; Peking says it will not talk until all American troops are out of Vietnam. Both preconditions are utterly unrealistic. One of the fundamental reasons for negotiations is precisely to arrange for a cease-fire and nonintervention.

Unquestionably, President Johnson worries about the effect on South Vietnamese morale of any move toward negotiations, but the recent upheavals in Saigon have indicated that the will to resist the Vietcong, even among the commanders of the armed forces, is already near the vanishing point.

Time is working against the United States. Secretary Thant is right in saying that the situation is going "from bad to worse." The notion that to negotiate would be a defeat for the United States has become one of the most pernicious misapprehensions of the conflict. The United States is amply proving its military strength and its determination to stay in South Vietnam in present circumstances. An agreement to negotiate surrenders nothing; it opens up the possibility for determining whether the goals of effective neutralization now being sought militarily can be achieved at the conference table.

The most significant thing that Secretary Thant said yesterday was this: "I am sure that the great American people, if it only knows the true facts, will agree with me that further bloodshed is unnecessary and that political and diplomatic negotiations alone can create conditions that will enable the United States to withdraw gracefully from that part of the world."

President Johnson is the man to whom the American people look for the true facts.

[From the New York Times]

#### INDIA URGES CONFERENCE ON VIETNAM

NEW DELHI, February 8.—India's External Affairs Ministry called today for a Geneva-type conference for Vietnam and said it was "essential for a peaceful and enduring solution to the problem."

Shortly after this statement was issued, Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri said he was writing to President Johnson and Premier Aleksei N. Kosygin of the Soviet Union

to urge that they meet as soon as possible to insure that peace is not disturbed in southeast Asia.

Mr. Shastri spoke upon emerging from two almost consecutive half-hour meetings with Premier Georges Pompidou of France, who arrived today with his wife and Foreign Minister Maurice Couve de Murville on an 8-day official visit to India. Mr. Pompidou observed that he was glad to say he had found the positions of the French and Indian Governments on Vietnam "very close."

The External Affairs Ministry's statement said, "There should be an immediate suspension of all provocative action in South Vietnam as well as in North Vietnam by all sides."

India is chairman of all three international control commissions set up in Geneva at the seven-power conference of 1954 to maintain peace in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Although not a participant in that conference, India was invited to head the control commissions.

[From the New York Times]

#### UNITED NATIONS: THE FRUSTRATIONS OF THE U.N.

(By James Reston)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., February 18.—The weakness of the United Nations was never more obvious than in its present paralysis over the Vietnamese crisis. It could not hope to settle that conflict, for it was never organized to deal with the disputes among the great powers, but at least it was organized to talk, and it is not even talking about Vietnam.

The excuses for not talking about it are clear enough. Three of the four major antagonists in Vietnam—Communist China, North Vietnam, and South Vietnam—are not members of the international organization.

The Communists regard the Vietnamese struggle as an internal war of national liberation, and therefore deny the competence of the U.N. to deal with it. The Soviet Union would veto any action on the question by the Security Council, and the General Assembly is now so dominated by the new nations of Asia and Africa that even the Johnson administration is not sure it would be supported in that body.

#### SECURITY AND MONEY

Beyond all that, U.N. officials are so worried about the security problems that would arise in New York if the Chinese Communists were to come here to discuss the Vietnamese question that they are not eager to get into the controversy. And they are so concerned about the financial bankruptcy of the U.N. that they are talking more about money and voting than they are about their principal responsibility, which is the maintenance of peace.

Nevertheless, there are at least three arguments for having a U.N. debate on the subject of Vietnam or any other threat to the peace. First, the principles and spirit of the U.N. Charter require it. Second, the U.N. will be weakened even more than it now is if it ignores Vietnam. And third, a U.N. debate might have a restraining effect on the military operations in Vietnam and would probably end with a resolution that would put pressure on both sides to negotiate an honorable settlement.

What is going on now over Vietnam is an increasingly dangerous military struggle amidst a tangle of verbal obscurities and misleading propaganda.

The Communists are engaged there in what they call a "war of national liberation," which any careful debate in the U.N. would expose as nothing more than an international war for Communist domination of the whole country and peninsula.

Washington is also playing the obscurantist game. The President says he "wants no

wider war," but widens it anyway by bombing North Vietnam. These bombing raids, however, are not usually described as "bombings" or as "raids," but as "responses."

#### HYPOCRISY UNLIMITED

At least a debate in the U.N. would expose this hypocrisy on all sides, including the hypocrisy of our allies, who are treaty-bound to help us in South Vietnam, but are doing nothing of the sort. And while a debate would cause us some embarrassment in the U.N., it would surely make clear the central fact—namely, that Washington went into that country originally to prevent the Communists from overpowering the South Vietnamese in violation of specific international agreements.

The United Nations is in a sad plight. It is broke, but it need not be bankrupt in spirit. More than likely it is not going to be able to take effective military action in the future to oppose aggression, as it did in the Congo.

All it has left, therefore, is the power to talk and clarify, to appeal to the conscience of the peoples, and if it is going to give up this responsibility it will have little or nothing left in the field of international politics.

The Secretary General of the United Nations has tried to get the antagonists in Vietnam into negotiations, but both he and the Pope have been brushed aside—even in Washington.

The main reason for the weakness of the U.N. today, of course, is that its principles have constantly been violated by the Communist nations ever since it was founded 20 years ago. Washington, however, also has to take a part of the blame.

#### BLOC VOTING

For it was the United States that started the practice of bloc voting in the organization. Now the Communists have taken it up, and with all the new nations from Africa and Asia, they have a bloc that threatens to overwhelm, not only the American bloc, but the principles of the charter as well.

The U.N. cannot be revived, however, by silence and capitulation. It has to speak out for its principles in the Vietnamese crisis, even if it cannot make them prevail.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

#### ILLUSIONS AND FALSE ANALOGIES

Assuming that there is still time to think about Vietnam—that the deadly cycle of military escalation is not yet irreversible—Americans should examine the validity of the official rationale for the reprisal bombings of North Vietnam.

The rationale is that attacks on South Vietnamese and American bases are planned, armed and supplied predominantly from the north, and that the attacks will stop if we hit the north hard enough. The fatal flaw in this theory is that the major portion of the weapons used by the Vietcong are American weapons, captured and turned against us. While supplies from the north undoubtedly help the Vietcong, there is little basis for supposing that they are indispensable, or that the Vietcong would fade away if supply lines could be cut—even if the lines could be cut by air action alone, which is most improbable.

Should it not be clear by now that we are not dealing with a simple case of external aggression, as the official policy of our Government assumes? If after 10 years of steadily increasing American aid the South Vietnamese Government is weaker than it was before, then something other than externally supported subversion must be involved.

All the evidence points to a high degree of local sympathy or outright support for the Vietcong as a major element in its success. The bombing of North Vietnam does

3478

not touch this source of conflict and probably strengthen it.

The false assumption of external aggression as the essential element in the situation is strategic as well as tactical. It is one of the major reasons our forces are in Vietnam.

Apologists for official policy are fond of quoting Churchill's warning about the partition of Czechoslovakia in 1938—"The belief that security can be obtained by throwing a small state to the wolves is a fatal delusion."

Czechoslovakia, however, was a victim of direct external aggression. What we face in Vietnam is the quite different problem of an indigenous revolution, 25 years in the making, which has succeeded in ending French colonialism and withstanding 10 years of American intervention.

In such a situation even our great military strength does not give us power to decide, by a simple decision to fight, that a small state shall be "saved." It is one thing to go to the aid of a nation under overt attack, and another to interfere in a local revolution, in which the essential element is not external aid but the people themselves. Only they can "win the war," and after 10 years of not winning, South Vietnam's will and capacity to do so must now be doubted.

Some Americans, of course, believe that it is our national mission to police the world, particularly to police it against revolution. That belief, in our view, is as immature as isolationism was, and indeed may well be an over-reaction to isolationism.

The United States tried to turn its back on the world, and failed; participation in the Second World War established firmly the commonsense proposition that for America involvement in international affairs is unavoidable. But what is involvement? Some Americans evidently swung so far from their isolationist past that they regard involvement as deciding everything for everybody, and particularly deciding the nature and scope of social revolution anywhere. A role in world leadership certainly is the American mission, but we need a more sensible view of what world leadership really is.

The truth is that Vietnam does not present a simple case of external aggression, direct or indirect, and a policy based on that false assumption is bound to fail, as ours has failed for 10 years. No matter how strenuously we may justify the bombing of North Vietnam to ourselves, and no matter how well it might be defended as pure reprisal or revenge, the fact remains that there is no military solution to the problem so far as the United States is concerned.

If we step up our attacks and the degree of our involvement, and even if we do not provoke Chinese or Russian intervention, all we can really expect is to take over the whole war from the South Vietnamese—in other words, to occupy and govern South Vietnam indefinitely.

What would such an occupation gain for us? It would not serve our true national interests, it would poison our relations with half the world, and it would hamper our freedom of maneuver in more important areas of conflict.

Our Vietnam policy is at a dead end. Our interests can now be served only by a political rather than a military solution, one that will enable us ultimately to end a profitless involvement in a profitless Asian land war. Unless President Johnson is seeking a political solution, he is not only risking nuclear war but basing national policy on dangerous illusions.

[From the New York Times]

WASHINGTON: THE UNDECLARED AND UNEXPLAINED WAR

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 13.—The time has come to call a spade a bloody shovel. This country is in an undeclared and unexplained war in Vietnam. Our masters have

a lot of long and fancy names for it, like escalation and retaliation, but it is war just the same.

This cause of the war is plain enough. The North Vietnamese Communists, with the aid of Red China and to a lesser extent the Soviet Union, have sent their guerillas into South Vietnam in violation of the 1954 and 1962 Geneva agreements, for the express purpose of taking over the government and territory of South Vietnam.

#### AMERICA'S RESPONSE

The course of the war is equally plain. We were getting licked in South Vietnam. The Communists were steadily defeating the South Vietnamese armed forces, terrorizing a war-weary and indifferent population, and taking advantage of a divided and quarrelsome South Vietnamese Government.

More than that, the Communists were stepping up their attacks on the bases and barracks which serve the 23,000 American troops in South Vietnam, and it was in response to this that President Johnson ordered the bombing attacks on the Communist military installations in the south of North Vietnamese territory.

Very few people here question the necessity for a limited expansion of the war by U.S. bombers into Communist territory. The American and South Vietnamese position was crumbling fast, and the political and strategic consequences of defeat would have been serious for the free world all over Asia.

There is a point, however, where this exercise will become critical. As the military targets in the southern part of Communist Vietnam are knocked out, and our bombers move northward, they will soon come within the range of the North Vietnamese and Red Chinese Mig fighters, and if we get into that situation, the pressure for attacks on the air bases in North Vietnam and South China will steeply increase.

The immediate problem, therefore, is how to put enough pressure on the North Vietnamese to bring them into negotiations for a settlement of the war, without provoking a mass Communist counterattack we are in no position to meet.

This is a delicate and highly dangerous situation. The United States has the air and naval power to wipe out North Vietnam and the Chinese Air Force, if it comes into the battle. But the North Vietnamese have a quarter of a million men under arms who have never been committed to the battle at all, and few observers in Washington believe this force could be stopped without the intervention of a very large American army on the ground.

#### THE SILENT WHITE HOUSE

Nobody has made all this clear to the American people. President Johnson has not made a major speech on the details of this war since he entered the White House. Neither did President Kennedy. We have had one long speech on the subject by Secretary of Defense McNamara on March 26 of last year, and a lot of statements here and in Saigon, many of them highly optimistic and misleading. But the fact is that we are in a war that is not only undeclared and unexplained, but that has not even been widely debated in the Congress or the country.

The whole history of this century testifies to the difficulty of predicting the consequences of war. We imposed a policy of unconditional surrender on the Kaiser only to find that the two greater menaces of Communism and Nazism took his place. One of the main objectives of the two World Wars was the freedom of Eastern Europe, which ended up with less freedom under the Communists than it had before.

#### LIMITING THE WAR

Few people here question that President Johnson wants to limit the war in Vietnam

and avoid a ground war on the continent of Asia, but the future is not wholly in his control. He may be bombing merely to force a negotiated settlement, but the Chinese and the North Vietnamese don't know that. In fact neither do the American people, whose airmen are carrying out the President's orders.

Nor, for that matter, do the allies, who are treaty-bound to support us if we get into a larger war in southeast Asia. They will undoubtedly support a policy of limited retaliation in North Vietnam if it is for the purpose of negotiating a settlement, but they will not support us for long unless we define and limit our aims.

The implications of this war, then, extend far beyond Vietnam. President Johnson's hopes of building a strong alliance with Japan and the other free nations of Asia are not likely to be promoted by replaying the old script of American planes once more bombing Asians.

He has started on a massive program of reconstruction and development at home, but he can forget about his Great Society if he gets bogged down in a major land war in Asia on territory favorable to the enemy. Freedom expands in peace and authoritarian government in war, and this is precisely the danger now, for the Communists have the manpower to cause us an almost unmanageable situation not only in Vietnam but in Korea, and force us into a war that could divert our energies from the larger constructive purposes of the Nation.

In this situation it is difficult to understand why the problem is not discussed more openly by the President, why the terms of an honorable settlement are not defined, and why the negotiating efforts of the Secretary General of the United Nations and other world statesmen are so blithely brushed aside.

It is true that the instability, weakness and sensitivities of the South Vietnamese Government have to be kept in mind, but nobody is suggesting a sellout at their expense. The talk here is not about a Munich agreement but a Korean agreement in which South Vietnam, like South Korea, would be in a better position to order its own life.

This would not be ideal, but it would be better for the South Vietnamese and for the United States than what we have now, and it would be better for North Vietnam, and China than a larger war.

#### CHINA'S DANGER

For if this dangerous game gets out of hand, it is not likely that China's new industries, including her atomic installations at Taklamakan Desert in Central Sinkiang, will be spared. What her manpower can grab beyond her borders would be worth far less than what she would lose at home.

Somebody, however, has to make a move to reverse the trend and stop the present crooked course. For the moment, we seem to be standing mute in Washington, paralyzed before a great issue, and merely digging our thought deeper into the accustomed military rut.

SYRACUSE, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I send you this letter to indicate my appreciation of your article in the January 17 issue of the New York Times magazine, and my support of your demands for negotiations in the Vietnam conflict. My opinion that victory is impossible in Vietnam, and that the United States has no right to sponsor mindless fratricide there is shared by many of my professors and fellow students here at Syracuse University. Please continue to protest current U.S. policy, and persist in your demands for negotiations.

Yours truly,

Miss DALE BRABANT.

[From the Daily Courier, Grants Pass, Oreg.]  
SOLDIER SEES VIETNAM WAR AS FOOLISH,  
USELESS

We read, each day, about what is going on in Vietnam, periodically, we are given some correspondent's version of just what it is all about.

But what are the actual observations of the country, its people, and the fighting that go on in the heads of our servicemen stationed there? Only they can say.

We have been allowed to peek into one of these soldiers' minds via a letter he wrote to local kin and the view is rather startling. It also is eloquent and enlightening.

The writer is a captain in the U.S. Army, is a medical doctor, and is assigned to one of our advisory teams in South Vietnam. What he writes is this, in part:

"You asked about the advisory team. As far as I know, this is unclassified information. Incidentally, from occasional information which we get from our enemy, the Vietcong, they know each of us, our arrival dates, our ranks, serial numbers, and our jobs, so advisers are not too secret.

"Well, America was more or less 'invited' to help in this war many years ago and we are, therefore, 'guests' of the country.

"We supposedly do not actually fight the war, so it is a trifle different than your Korea. Someone said the other day, however, that, 'yes, we are advisers in the war. We drop several thousands of pounds of "advice" every day.'

"There are advisers for everything: cooks, artillery, infantry, commandos, doctors—everything except beggars, but they seem to make out fairly well anyway.

"My particular role is somewhat nebulous, I'm afraid, but it deals with helping Vietnamese Army doctors take care of civilians in their particular areas. I work in two different Provinces which lie directly north and directly south of Saigon. There are about 3 million people in the two states and about six fully trained doctors, so we have plenty to do usually. I am the leader of three grizzly sergeants, and we just travel around training Vietnamese Army medics in the treatment of the civilian population.

"We call it 'The Traveling Medicine Show' and the amount of actual good which we do is questionable. But you know the Army—it is not for us to question why \* \* \*."

"Saigon is a fantastic city. It is oriental enough to be full of intrigue and danger, and French enough to be beautiful and exciting. The city sprawls out like a big woman curled along the Saigon River. Saigon is the heart, the pride and the joy of all South Vietnam. She is the biggest center of industry, culture and population of the entire nation. I am afraid that I love her.

"But the people are the real reason for my existence. They are a beautiful, curious, industrious and active group. They are not as artistic or original as their Chinese ancestors, nor are they as aggressive as their Japanese neighbors. They are small, affectionate, beautiful, simple (superficially) and mystic. They have never really known peace, and their attitude in war is one of complacency and patience, almost indifference.

"They are good people. They have fed me when I was hungry, given me their mats when I was tired and given me their friendship and trust when I was a stranger. Someday I hope that I can return something to them.

"For it is a fabulous country, this Vietnam. High rugged mountains with their tops poked through the mist clouds, rushing white water and deep mountain pools, a beach of white-tan sand which stretches for 1,200 miles, islands that would give Hawaii jealousy, a jungle with all the color and danger and life of Africa, all superimposed upon a culture as old and as deep as the earth itself.

"War, of course, ruins it all, and I really believe that that is what the man who said 'war is hell' actually meant. Someday I shall tell you about the war, when we can talk for hours.

"The chief points are:

"(a) This is a war, despite what newspapers may call it, and (b) war is useless, pointless, and ridiculous.

"At first it was (and I hate to admit it) exciting: getting shot at, always worried about mines on the roads or mortars at night, and the sounds of artillery at night (it is a wonderful sound, you know), but then after a while, the foolishness and waste of it just gets downright tiresome.

"Useless, ridiculous, pointless, foolish, wasteful, tiresome. That's what wars are to the men who fight them. But so long as tyranny and jealousy and greed exist between nations, I imagine we can expect more useless, ridiculous, pointless, foolish, wasteful and tiresome wars, and more men will fight, and die, and learn the truth about the whole process."—H.L.E.

[From the Toronto Globe and Mail]

SEEKING A WAY TO SETTLE AN EXPANDING WAR

Prime Minister Lester Pearson proposed no solutions to the Vietnam dilemma in his speech this week, and he is undoubtedly right to insist, at this critical stage, that any specific views the Canadian Government has should be expressed privately in Washington. The United States carries a heavy and dangerous burden in Vietnam, and this is no time for friendly governments that do not share that burden to go fault-finding in public.

From Mr. Pearson's analysis of the problem, however, it is fairly plain that the Government sees a negotiated settlement leading to the withdrawal of all foreign forces, as the only way to peace and stability in southeast Asia.

Mr. Pearson sees no hope of mastering the Vietcong guerrilla forces in a continuing war confined to South Vietnam and only a faint hope that air attacks on North Vietnam might bring the Communist leadership to the conference table; in fact, such an enlargement of the war could well succeed in producing a major Far Eastern war between the United States and Communist China.

The Prime Minister endorses the appeal this week by the Government of India for "an immediate suspension of all provocative action in South Vietnam as well as North Vietnam by all sides," and an international conference to settle the future of the area.

This is substantially the way out urged repeatedly by President Charles de Gaulle of France. In the French view, no amount of force would be sufficient to defeat the Vietcong.

Mr. Pearson also drew attention to the essential weakness of the United States position in South Vietnam, in that the "free" Vietnamese Government it is supposed to be helping has no basis of popular support in the country.

Ideally, he said, there should be "a unified, independent, neutral Vietnam," ending both foreign intervention and the partition imposed by the 1954 Geneva agreement. But how to prevent a unified Vietnam from turning inevitably Communist under Chinese pressure?

The answer to Mr. Pearson's question is probably that no stable Vietnamese Government, North, South, or unified, can now be formed without Vietcong participation, if not dominance. The one realistic hope is, by international guarantees emerging from a news conference, to prevent southeast Asia from falling under the dominion of the Chinese Government.

In the present climate of American opinion, this is a difficult outlook for the U.S. Government to accept. A still greater obstacle to negotiation over southeast Asia is the fact that any conference would have to

include Communist China as one of the principally interested powers.

Under President Lyndon Johnson, U.S. policy shows no signs of abandoning its refusal to recognize the existence of China. The 1954 Geneva conference could be held without direct U.S. participation, because France was the Western Power mainly involved. This time it is the U.S. responsibility, and Washington's stubborn refusal to deal with Peiping is one of the major reasons why war continues and threatens to expand in southeast Asia, Korea, the Formosa Straits, and now Vietnam; crisis after crisis, and still the United States will not face the realities of power in the Far East. Mr. Johnson has rejected out of hand the international appeal for a new Geneva-style conference.

Yet, as the events of this week have shown, the only likely alternative to negotiation is escalating warfare. The Chinese-American war Mr. Pearson warned of is only part way up the escalator; at the top is a world holocaust. The whole world therefore is vitally concerned with the immediate future in Vietnam, and the world has a right to demand more from U.S. leadership than the present static policy of retaliatory or "deterrent" reactions to Vietcong attacks.

The air strikes on North Vietnam bases may be justified as an interim measure to stave off complete defeat for the United States-sponsored South Vietnam Government. But only if there is also a real effort to find a formula for peace.

[From the New York Times]

THE DANGERS IN VIETNAM

The Vietnamese situation has entered a new stage. The war will not be the same since the Vietcong attack on Pleiku and the reprisals against North Vietnam which continued yesterday. It seems axiomatic of this type of warfare that it either escalates or it stops. For the present, it is escalating and becoming more expensive in lives and more perilous every day.

Pleiku has once again proved, as Secretary McNamara said, that the American forces cannot protect themselves against this type of "sneak attack." Its sequel served notice on Hanoi—and indirectly on Peiping and Moscow—that the United States will retaliate when Americans are attacked. The whole affair indicates forcibly that the long-recognized dynamism of the Vietnamese conflict has risen to a dangerous level.

Secretary McNamara says that the situation has not reached a crisis; but it has done so in the sense that the United States is becoming less and less able to restrict the conflict to minor proportions. The possible choices of action or inaction are being steadily whittled down. The United States is gradually approaching a point where it either goes on to a major engagement involving North Vietnam and Communist China, or it actively seeks a diplomatic solution, which amounts to a disengagement on reasonable and honorable terms.

President Johnson has in the past denied that the United States has any intention of carrying the war to North Vietnam. Yet he considered it necessary in the past few days to help the South Vietnamese raid North Vietnam twice. Since it is not to be expected that the Vietcong in South Vietnam will cease their attacks on their tactics, and since Peiping and Moscow are committed to help Hanoi, the dangers of the future are only too obvious.

The Americans working on the Vietnamese problem in Washington and Saigon must often feel as if the problems have a nightmarish or fourth dimensional quality. Western ideas, modes of thought and methods do not function as it seems that they logically should. Mortars and bombs do speak a universal language; but they may ultimately lead to the unthinkable conclusions of a nuclear war.



The only sane way out is diplomatic, international, political, economic—not military. A solution will not be found by exchanging harder and harder blows. Surrender is out of the question and "victory" for either side is impossible.

Perhaps a new start can be made from an untried base—that Americans, Vietnamese, Chinese, and Russians are all sensible human beings who are ready for peace in southeast Asia, or at least willing to consider it. There would be prices to pay, but there would be gains as well as losses. Diplomacy is surely not yet a lost art or a dead language.

[From the New York Times]

#### BLACK DAY IN VIETNAM

The slugging match in Vietnam continues; the war escalates; the danger grows; the goal of peace recedes. Just in 1 day—yesterday—many Americans were killed when an enlisted men's barracks was blown up by Vietcong terrorists, while in the north, in a pitched battle that began on Monday, Vietcong guerrillas wiped out five companies of South Vietnamese troops. Everybody concerned is braced for Washington's response, in accordance with the new policy of reprisals.

There is a frightening "normality" about the situation. Events are occurring with the inexorability of a Greek tragedy. President de Gaulle, who yesterday returned to his suggestion of another Geneva Conference and a negotiated settlement, was right in saying that the war cannot be won no matter how much air and naval power the United States commits or what reprisals China may take. It cannot be won by any outsider, American or Chinese.

Washington evidently hopes that if North Vietnam is threatened enough or punished enough it will agree to a truce, Korean style; and then the United States will be in a position to negotiate peace or a controlled neutralization from a position of strength. The greatest weakness of this reprisal policy against North Vietnam is that while it is true the Vietcong gets orders, advice, some arms and some men from North Vietnam, the war is being fought in South Vietnam. That is where American lives were lost yesterday and where American-trained and armed Vietnamese soldiers were defeated.

The Vietcong live and operate in South Vietnam, using American arms captured from the Vietnamese. The peasants either help them, or accept them, or are cowed into submission by them. The guerrillas, as Vietminh against the French a few years ago, or as Vietcong today, have been fighting for two decades. They are tough, dedicated, fanatical, well trained. Perhaps they are not winning, but certainly they are not losing. Meanwhile, each day that passes gives further evidence of the relentless escalation of the conflict.

This is what gives special point to President de Gaulle's renewed suggestion to recall the 14-nation Geneva Conference to seek an "international accord excluding all foreign intervention" in southeast Asia. The key factor in the De Gaulle proposal—and the main stumbling block for the United States—is that no conference and no settlement is possible in that region without the participation of Communist China. Whether we like it or not—and we do not like it—Communist China is an interested party; and the United States knows of course that North Vietnam cannot be bombed as if Communist China did not exist.

There may still be a choice: talk or fight. If everybody waits too long, the chance to talk will be gone.

[From the New York Times]

#### GREATNESS BY RETRAINT

Escalation of the war in Vietnam, such as took place last week, has led the United

States to the entrance of a one-way street. If followed to the bitter end, this road could lead to a major war involving Communist China and probably the Soviet Union. But there is still time to stop.

A great power can demonstrate its greatness by its restraint. The United States has the air and naval power to destroy everything of importance in North Vietnam; but this country would show itself to be far wiser and far stronger by refraining from doing so than by pursuing a policy of repetitive retaliation, which is at once so seductive and so dangerous. Despite the administration's oft-restated desire "to avoid spreading the conflict," this present policy of reprisals is inexorably carrying the United States into a major armed struggle in southeast Asia—unless a halt is called, and soon.

When President Johnson ordered last Sunday's retaliatory strike after the Vietcong attack on Pleiku, there was understanding and support for his action. Yet, it was recognized that the two actions—the assault on a U.S. military installation in South Vietnam and the American decision to respond by striking at staging areas in North Vietnam—vastly increased the perils to world peace that have always been inherent in the Vietnamese conflict.

Now each side feels obliged to match a show of power by the other with an even greater response—a course that can only invite holocaust. For the United States the problem is made severer by the impossibility of striking effectively at the Vietcong without carrying the war into North Vietnam and thus intensifying the pressure on Peking and Moscow to become actively involved.

President Johnson is up against his greatest foreign policy test. Surely he knows that the complex problems of Vietnam and southeast Asia cannot be settled by arms alone. An infinity of social, political, economic, religious, tribal, nationalistic, historic and traditional factors are at work in Vietnam. This country can best demonstrate its wisdom and responsibility by keeping its powder dry and meanwhile trying patience, diplomacy and negotiation.

History, good intentions and a concatenation of events have led the United States into a morass where we sink deeper each day. The Vietnamese conflict should not be almost exclusively a U.S. burden. The Russians have good reasons to want peace in Vietnam. The French want to bring about an international conference. So does United Nations Secretary General Thant. The Chinese would probably refuse to attend one or even to compromise; but nobody will know unless a conference is tried.

What the United States is now doing in Vietnam is playing directly into the hands of Communist China by taking actions that—however defensive in intent—lead to a steadily escalating, and hence more dangerous, conflict. This, surely, is the last thing in the world that the Johnson administration and the American people want. Therefore something else should be tried, and this something has to be negotiation with all parties concerned.

The United States has made its point very forcefully with bombs during the last week. Its power is indisputable. In the light of the strength this country has shown, it can now offer to continue the argument over a conference table where its power will be undiminished. But the outcome might then be peace instead of war.

[From the New York Times]

#### THE PRESIDENT ON VIETNAM

If the United States has a policy in South Vietnam, its outlines do not emerge with any clarity from the statement President Johnson appended to his speech before the National Industrial Conference Board yesterday.

The President reiterates that this coun-

try wants no wider war, yet his statement surrenders all initiative to the Vietcong and their external allies. "Our continuing actions will be those that are justified and made necessary by the continuing aggression of others," Mr. Johnson says. He stresses that the United States seeks no conquest and that its sole aim is to "join in the defense and protection of the freedom of a brave people."

All this is admirable as a reaffirmation of the consistent American position on the Vietnamese conflict, but it provides no answer to two factors that have emerged with overwhelming force in recent weeks. One is that the South Vietnamese, ruled by a succession of fragile governments under the domination of bickering warlords, are showing little appetite for doing any fighting in their own defense or even for helping to guard our troops against sneak attack. The second is that the nature of the Vietcong guerrilla tactics makes it almost impossible to hit back at the Communist forces without carrying the attack into North Vietnam and thus creating the wider war the President wants to avoid.

Each northward strike enlarges the peril of active intervention by Communist China and increases the pressure on Soviet Russia to abandon the withdrawn position it so plainly prefers. What is still lacking in the President's formulation is any hint of the circumstances under which a negotiated settlement, of the type proposed by Secretary General Thant of the United Nations, might be approached. Without such a move, the potentiality of a vastly expanded war increases each day.

[From the New York Times]

#### THE WAR HAWKS

A comparatively small group of Americans, at this moment predominantly political in character and predominantly Republican in politics, is doing its best to multiply the perils and frustrations of the war in southeast Asia.

This group ignores the realities of the present situation. It ignores the obvious weariness of the people of South Vietnam. It ignores the steady stream of desertions from the Vietnamese Army. It ignores the difficulty of protecting isolated American bases against the surprise attacks of guerrillas.

It ignores the possibility of an invasion of South Vietnam by the very considerable North Vietnamese Army. It ignores the problem of how an aerial counterattack could cope successfully with a massive ground attack of this character. It ignores the possibility of Chinese intervention. It ignores the logistics and belittles the cost in lives lost, blood spilled and treasure wasted, of fighting a war on a jungle front 7,000 miles from the coast of California.

The whole aim of this group is to expand the Vietnamese war, even if it means drawing in China and perhaps the Soviet Union as well. By its lights, President Johnson's declaration that the United States seeks no wider war is as much a prescription for failure as any attempt at a negotiated peace. It is one thing to say, as Secretary McNamara did in his testimony yesterday, that this country has "no other alternative than continuing to support South Vietnam against the Red guerrilla onslaught." It is quite another to argue that the road out of the present hazardous situation is to invite world destruction. The American people made it overwhelmingly clear in the last election that they do not want to plunge recklessly down that road.

[From the New York Times]

#### NEGOTIATE OR ESCALATE

It is time for someone in Washington to remember John F. Kennedy's words in his inaugural address: "Let us never negotiate



continued market access for U.S. farm products." This, in a nutshell, is the U.S. position.

Whether the U.S. position will finally prevail depends largely on two things:

First, the extent to which the Common Market is willing to concede in matters of agriculture in order to win for its booming industry a bigger slice of the rich U.S. consumer market. "European industrialists," Mr. Ioanes predicts, "will be our most important ally in arguing for trade liberalization."

Second, U.S. success depends, too, on Washington's determination to withstand pressures from certain segments of American industry; pressures, that is, to subordinate farm exports if necessary to accomplish quick settlement of industrial trade liberalization.

Indeed, a nagging fear that agriculture may be "sold out" at the bargaining table is the chief worry of a so far small but audible group of administration critics. In support of their concern, they charge that the United States has already backed down from its tough-line pledge that agricultural and industrial trade would be negotiated only as a single package, not separately. Late last year, U.S. negotiators in Geneva agreed to temporarily table topics of agricultural trade and to take up industrial trade differences.

"It's a change in tactics rather than substance," officials here retort. What's more, it's added, the U.S. position is the same as before: No trade agreement will be concluded that does not include concessions for U.S. agriculture. "That's definite."

On at least one often-asked question—Washington's timetable for achieving bargaining table victory—negotiators are both officially and unofficially mum. "If you have a deadline and the other fellow doesn't," insists Mr. Ioanes, "you always lose."

Despite the earlier analogy of an international poker game for high stakes, it's fervently contended here that if more liberal trade can be won, then everyone is a winner. American farmers have plenty of reason to hope so. It's their chips.

#### THE CRISIS IN VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, we read in the Washington Post of February 24 exactly what we have had reason to expect during the recent weeks. One of South Vietnam's Buddhist leaders, Thich Tam Chau, told a gathering, "You cannot win the war through fighting. Killing Vietcong guerrillas was the same as killing brothers." This, of course, will probably be followed by statements of other Buddhist leaders in power in South Vietnam and then probably by some of the ambitious generals who have banished the former strong man, Gen. Nguyen Khanh, that they seek an end to "civil war" and "Americans go home."

Today, Mr. President, the Prime Minister of South Vietnam announced that his nation should not continue the conflict and he sought peace with honor for South Vietnam. This according to the 7:30 o'clock radio report.

Do we have a duty to send our armed forces into the jungles to maintain freedom for some 8 million people who do not have the will to preserve freedom for themselves?

Do we Americans have a mandate from Almighty God to police the world?

Mr. President, when the conflict was raging in South Korea and American lives were being lost, this was derisively

termed "Truman's war" by some persons. In 1954 we became involved in South Vietnam. Our Commander in Chief sent in fighting men of our armed services. General Eisenhower was President then. You remember early in 1954 Vice President Nixon announced that President Eisenhower was planning to send our ground forces into Indochina and following that after a period of vacillation a few hundred soldiers were sent there.

Nixon is still a war hawk. Both he and former presidential candidate Barry Goldwater are urging that we bomb Hanoi. In 1954, following Vice President Nixon's statement which apparently somewhat vexed the then President, President Eisenhower then modified his position somewhat and plans were temporarily postponed to send in some thousands of soldiers.

In 1954 and the following years under President Eisenhower an increasing number of men of our Air Forces and ground forces went into South Vietnam, then a part of Indochina. They were termed military advisers. By 1961 when President Eisenhower left the White House we were committed with our Armed Forces in South Vietnam, a country where religious controversy then as now raged between the Catholic and Buddhist leaders. Many people in South Vietnam even then were saying "Yankee go home." That chorus from Saigon has increased in volume as time went on and the number of Americans stationed over there increased. There is just as much justification for terming the conflict in South Vietnam "Eisenhower's war" as there ever was for terming the Korean war as "Truman's war."

Do not be surprised if a newly formed government in South Vietnam announces to the world that Americans should get out. Either leaders of the government now being formed or of the next one which, judging the immediate future by the past, may be only a few weeks from now may do so.

It appears that officials of the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and perhaps also North Vietnam are hinting that negotiations could be undertaken to end this civil war. It is my judgment that our officials in Saigon and in Washington should be receptive to any negotiations initiated to end a conflict where from 1954, when under President Eisenhower we committed our Armed Forces to southeast Asia, the lives of 300 Americans in our Armed Forces have been lost in this effort to repel Communist aggression and guerrilla infiltration in what was Indochina.

In South Vietnam we have observed an unparalleled and fantastic instability of governing groups with some eight changes of government in a mere 16-week period. This instability and evident lack of will on the part of the people of South Vietnam to save themselves from the aggressors to the north is a great handicap to the forces of the free world.

Is it better we retain a professional general, Maxwell Taylor, as Ambassador though he must have incurred animosity of some leaders in South Vietnam during

the months of turmoil with things going from bad to worse during the time he represented us as Ambassador? It would have been natural also for any Ambassador during such period to have acquired likes and also dislikes toward some of the South Vietnamese officials with whom he had dealt. Would it not be better that we send in a skilled and experienced diplomat—one of our great men—a civilian—whose career has been marked with successes and who deservedly enjoys the confidence of all Americans? A fresh start in that direction might be advisable. I would suggest Ambassador Averell Harriman or Ambassador Adlai Stevenson or former Senator Kenneth Keating.

The Founding Fathers provided that in the United States civilian authority must always be supreme over military authority. Personally, I lack confidence in a professional general as ambassador of the United States in a critical area in this grim cold war period. Is the decision to win the war in Vietnam worth the risk and sacrifice? I believe it is. Unquestionably, our administration should make it crystal clear at this time to the heads of state throughout the world that we have committed our forces to save South Vietnam from Communist aggression. We will not withdraw until the civil war raging in South Vietnam is ended and Vietcong infiltrators and aggressors abandon their operations. Very definitely we shall continue to repel force with force. Very definitely we shall destroy staging areas within North Vietnam where installations used by Vietcong forces are located. Very definitely it is irresponsible talk to urge that our warplanes bomb and destroy Hanoi.

Mr. President, we shall continue to fulfill our commitments to the Government of South Vietnam. However, that Government has failed miserably to obtain the loyalty and support of the South Vietnamese people. That Government—if it can be called a government at this point—is nothing more than a series of military dictators each grabbing for himself what he can before he is overthrown by a fellow officer. Our Vietnam policy is almost at a dead end. I believe that our interests can now be served best by a political and diplomatic solution rather than by military means which to date have failed. A reasonable diplomatic solution to this problem would end a profitless involvement in an armed conflict which has resulted in terrific casualties to the Vietcong and substantial casualties to armed forces and civilians of South Vietnam. After 10 years of steadily increasing American aid to South Vietnam, the Government there is weaker than it was before and its ability and capacity to win the war there must be doubted. Unfortunately, 300 Americans have been killed in this conflict and many more wounded.

We should again state to the heads of state of the world through our embassies that as soon as the Communists to the north agree to withdraw their forces from South Vietnam and agree to leave their neighbors to the south alone, and demonstrate their good faith by their actions, we will immediately withdraw

our forces. Surely an honorable truce and neutralization of Vietnam is to be hoped for and it should be achieved at the conference table. We wish to see an independent South Vietnam safe from aggression and free to determine in peace the kind of government its people wish. Such a South Vietnam should not be menaced nor would it menace its neighbors.

Our President has made it clear we seek no bases and that we shall withdraw our forces when the Communists leave their neighbors to the south alone. Let us face the facts. It is too late now to argue that President Eisenhower was wrong in committing our forces in 1954 in the first instance. That is history. It would be as wrong to term the Vietnam conflict "Eisenhower's war" as it was unfortunate and untruthful to term the Korean war as "Truman's war." The free world would gain if there were to be a conference in Geneva or London or Hong Kong where the representatives of the heads of state of North and South Vietnam, Red China, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, Japan, India, Australia, Thailand, Pakistan, France, and the United States, and representatives of other nations of Europe and Asia, negotiate fully and freely to neutralize all of what was once Indochina. The facts are that by negotiation we have achieved complete neutralization of Korea and Austria. Laos has also been neutralized. The limited nuclear test ban has been achieved. This treaty has not been violated by the Soviet Union nor by any other nation. Now is the time to hope to add North and South Vietnam to the list of neutral areas.

It appears that we have demonstrated our strength in the retaliatory blows we have struck from our carriers and that the South Vietnam forces have defended themselves over the last 10 years and that now is the time for diplomats and foreign affairs officials of the Communist nations and the leaders of North and South Vietnam and the nations of the free world to offer to negotiate.

#### PROSECUTION OF NAZI WAR CRIMINALS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the West German cabinet voted yesterday to support an extension of the May 8 deadline which now marks the end of the period of limitations for the prosecution of Nazi war criminals. This matter will be acted upon by the Bundestag in a debate to begin on March 10. I express the hope that the Bundestag may follow the cabinet in ratifying this decision.

Normally, we do not consider what is taking place in the parliament of another government. However, this is properly a subject cognizable everywhere, including the U.S. Senate, because it deals with world crimes of the most heinous character—designated world crimes by the tribunal at Nuremberg and by the action which that tribunal took in the name of legality and justice throughout the world. Those words—"legality" and "justice"—are the key words which were used in the resolution adopted by the West German cabi-

net. All of us must feel deeply gratified that Chancellor Ludwig Erhard has led his cabinet into making this constructive decision.

Much is at stake—not only bringing to justice men guilty of the most heinous crimes, but also upholding the conscience of the people of Germany in the eyes of the whole world, and upholding, too, the image of the Federal Republic of Germany as being a government determined and empowered by the people to do justice in its own heart with respect to the crimes committed by Hitler and his cohorts in the name of the German people.

When this is done, the responsibility for action will rest clearly upon East Germany and the satellite powers of the Soviet Union, which have made many allegations that they have evidence of Nazi criminals not yet prosecuted who will escape prosecution if the deadline of the statute of limitations is not extended. I am confident now that the deadline will be extended by the will of the German people. We shall see now whether the Communist countries will play politics with elementary justice and hide from the just punishment of their crimes thousands of Nazi criminals concerning whom they claim to harbor information. It seems to me that what is proposed by the West German cabinet is the way the matter should be handled.

As one who believes there can be a Pan-European renaissance and a unified Germany if the path of justice and righteousness is pursued, I am deeply gratified that this action has been taken.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "West German Cabinet Supports Extension of Nazi Crimes Law," written by Philip Shabecoff, and published in the New York Times of February 25, 1965.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### WEST GERMAN CABINET SUPPORTS EXTENSION OF NAZI CRIMES LAW

(By Philip Shabecoff)

Bonn, February 24.—The West German Cabinet voted unanimously today to support the proposed extension of the statute of limitations for the prosecution of Nazi war criminals beyond the May 8 deadline.

A Government statement said that the decision was based on the fact that new evidence indicated that criminal acts committed during World War II would go unpunished if the 20-year statute were allowed to expire as scheduled.

Today's vote in effect reverses the decision last November 5 when the Cabinet declared that legal obstacles prevented extension of the statute.

Chancellor Ludwig Erhard said at the time that he disagreed with that decision but would go along with his Cabinet.

However, the Government took pains in today's gingerly worded statement to note that it had not specifically reversed its previous decision.

"The Federal Government," the statement said, "will support the German Bundestag (lower House of Parliament) in its efforts to create the possibility of satisfying justice while maintaining the principles of legality."

In other words, the Federal Government will not itself make any suggestions to extend the statute of limitations, but will support legislation introduced in Parliament that is designed to do just that.

A Bundestag debate on extension of the statute is scheduled for March 10.

The cautious tone of the Cabinet statement was a case of political egg walking. Dr. Ewald Bucher, West Germany's Minister of Justice, has steadfastly maintained that the statute could not be legally extended and has threatened to resign if the Cabinet did not accept his recommendations.

Dr. Bucher based his opposition to an extension of the statute on article 103 of the West German Constitution, which prohibits retroactive legislation.

However, Parliament can amend the Constitution and probably will do so if it desires to extend the statute.

#### STEP HELD MORALLY DEFENSIBLE

It has been contended that such an amendment would weaken the rule of law in West Germany's young democracy. But current opinion seems to hold that bypassing the ex post facto provision in this particular instance is morally defensible.

Dr. Bucher went along today with a Cabinet decision that in effect shifted responsibility for action to Parliament.

Apparently Dr. Bucher felt he could go along with the Cabinet since it was not specifically repudiating its previous position and in so doing rejecting his own recommendations.

Today's vote actually was to approve a report on the action taken against Nazi criminals and to be presented to the Bundestag March 1. The Government statement declared the investigation and prosecution of Nazi misdeeds was "unique in extent in all legal history."

The report noted that about 70,000 Germans had already been sentenced for Nazi war crimes in West Germany and abroad and that under systematic investigations not yet completed 13,000 other prosecutions were underway.

The Government pointed out that it had appealed to the nations of the world to make available any information pertaining to Nazi crimes not yet investigated.

It noted that much additional material had come in from Eastern-bloc states and that officials of East Germany had declared that they had tons of documents relating to war crimes that had not yet been sifted 20 years after the war's end.

"The suspicion of propagandistic misuse (of these materials) is hardly avoidable," the Government said.

It concluded in its report "that contrary to the previous assumption, the possibility cannot be excluded that new punishable acts will become known after May 8, 1965, which would necessarily occasion further investigation."

New information aside, informed observers here believe that the Cabinet decision on the statute was in large part influenced by a shift in political sentiment recently.

West German opinion on extending the statute may have been ambivalent last fall, but there seems to be wide sentiment for extension today.

This sentiment appears to have been reinforced by the belief that West Germany let Israel down when it canceled arms shipments to her under pressure from the United Arab Republic.

#### THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record certain editorials and communications which I have received expressing opposition to a continuation of the U.S. undeclared war in Asia.

There being no objection, the editorials and communications were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

of a stable government in South Vietnam and the withdrawal of U.S. forces "from that part of the world."

The Secretary General said at a news conference that he had presented "concrete ideas and proposals" to "some of the principal parties directly involved in the question of Vietnam," including the United States. He declined to disclose their responses.

Mr. Thant reiterated his belief that the prospects for a peaceful settlement would become more and more remote "with the passage of time" but that it was not too late to make an attempt at "diplomatic and political methods."

He did not directly criticize the Johnson administration's refusal to agree to negotiations on Vietnam. He said he had "the greatest respect for the great American leader, President Johnson, whose wisdom, moderation and sensitivity to world public opinion are well known."

#### GREAT AMERICAN PEOPLE

At the same time, Mr. Thant declared: "I am sure that the great American people, if only they know the true facts and the background to the developments in South Vietnam, will agree with me that further bloodshed is unnecessary."

"The political and diplomatic method of discussions and negotiations alone can create conditions which will enable the United States to withdraw gracefully from that part of the world. As you know, in times of war and of hostilities the first casualty is truth."

A U.S. spokesman declined to comment on Mr. Thant's statement.

The Secretary General was informed after his news conference that the Soviet Union and France had decided to take preliminary action toward a conference on Vietnam. He commented that this was "not unexpected."

#### PLAN DEALS WITH TECHNIQUE

Reliable sources said that Mr. Thant's proposals dealt with the technique of negotiating rather than the substance of a settlement. According to these sources, Mr. Thant has suggested a series of informal talks, with himself or some other third party as an intermediary, between the principal parties, including the United States, Communist China, North and South Vietnam, France, the Soviet Union, and Britain.

The Secretary General, it was understood, envisions a series of interlinked "dialogs" as a preliminary to negotiations at a formal conference.

Instead of direct talks between the United States and China, for example, the intermediary would talk with a U.S. representative, then discuss the issues in dispute with a Chinese representative, and so on.

The Secretary General did not explain what "facts" regarding Vietnam were not known by the American people.

A United Nations source said Mr. Thant felt that Americans were not adequately informed about two "facts" the Secretary General considers important: that military action will not resolve the situation and that Communist China, which the United States has refused to recognize is a factor.

Citing the example of his native Burma, which was confronted with a widespread Communist insurrection after independence in 1948, Mr. Thant criticized the U.S. policy of supplying military advisers and equipment to South Vietnam for the suppression of the Vietcong guerrillas.

The Secretary General, who had cabinet status from 1948 until he became Burmese representative at the United Nations in 1957, said that "the Burmese Government dealt with this internal problem by its own means, without asking for any outside military assistance or outside military arms or outside military advisers—or whatever you call them.

"The Burmese Communist Party is still underground after 17 years and still illegal," he added, "but let me tell you: There has not been a single instance of outside help to the Burmese Communists inside Burma in the last 17 years. And Burma has maintained and still maintains the friendliest relations with all its neighbors—with Thailand, with Laos, with mainland China, with India, and with Pakistan."

#### NOT ONE AMERICAN LIFE

Pointing out that Burma has a 1,000-mile frontier with Communist China, the Secretary General said that if she had requested outside assistance to suppress insurrection, one of two things would have happened: "Either the country would be divided into two parts or the whole country would have become Communist long ago."

"Not one American life has been lost in Burma," Mr. Thant said. "Not one American dollar has been spent in Burma in the last 17 years. We should ask the great question: Why?"

The Secretary General suggested last Friday that the 1954 Geneva Conference on Indochina be reconvened to take up the Vietnam question, but this is opposed by the State Department.

Asked if he was still in favor of such a move, he replied that "if there are still difficulties on the part of some of the large powers as regards the immediate convening of a Geneva-type conference, it could be worth while exploring the possibilities of informal, private, and confidential dialogs between some of the parties directly involved, as a preliminary step toward the convening of a more formal conference."

He remarked that he had never advocated the immediate withdrawal of U.S. forces from South Vietnam, then said:

"But I feel that once the diplomatic and political methods have been tried, and if there is any perceptible improvement in the situation, if an agreed formula is at hand, if some sort of stability can be restored in the country, then at that time, of course, the United States can withdraw its troops with dignity."

#### CONTROL OF OIL IMPORTS

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I wish to address this body for a few minutes on a subject of great interest to both the coal producers and the oil producers in my State, and of vital concern to all the United States—the question of the integrity of the Johnson administration's program controlling imports of oil into this country.

Recent pronouncements by the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, give rise to suspicion that the oil imports control program—already riddled by politically motivated loopholes—is about to be manipulated anew.

I refer to Mr. Udall's announcement of February 11, which he evidently timed very nicely, so as to coincide with Congress recent absence from Washington. At a press conference on that day, he revealed plans to juggle the U.S. import program, so as to allow an additional 50,000 barrels a day of petroleum feedstock from the Caribbean to enter via Puerto Rico.

Mr. Udall attempts to justify this latest of a series of special decisions under the oil-import program by saying that it would benefit the economy of Puerto Rico. I have no doubt that it would help Puerto Rico's self-sufficiency, and this

is a goal all of us would favor. Thanks to the special import quota Mr. Udall has promised, one American oil company is planning to invest \$600 million in a sprawling petrochemical complex on that beautiful island.

As I suggested, I am all for Puerto Rico's boosting her economy by all appropriate means. We must admire and salute the Puerto Rican people on the success of their Operation Bootstrap. I wish them the very best.

The point I wish to make, however, is that while we may applaud the benefits to Puerto Rico from Mr. Udall's efforts, we had better make extra sure that in the bargain, he does not destroy the integrity of a program affecting the energy market and, indeed, the economic balance of the entire United States.

I pose no idle conjecture. This single project proposes dumping from 15,000 to 25,000 barrels a day of gasoline into the already chaotic east coast U.S. gasoline market. And beyond the immediate threat of dumping products and byproducts in the U.S. market is the very real prospect that this will create new pressures for additional patchworks in what is already a crazy quilt of special deals.

Right now, for example, I understand that the Interior Department has under consideration some special import arrangements for a duty-free petrochemical complex in the New Orleans area.

According to press reports on his recent news conference, Mr. Udall called his Puerto Rico deal "inviting in terms of hemisphere politics." That is a nice choice of words; but his remarks would have been just as pertinent without the word "hemisphere."

From the start, politics seems to have been the yardstick of this program. One has only to leaf through back copies of oil industry publications to discover all sorts of examples.

Here one finds an account of probably the largest existing loophole; that is, until Mr. Udall's Puerto Rico proposal. This is the so-called northern tier situation.

An article in the Oil Daily for November 26, 1962, tells about two oil companies which are, to this day, receiving special treatment, totaling well over 15,000 barrels a day.

Under the Trade Expansion Act, President Johnson must give his blessing to any substantial changes in the oil-import program. Therefore, before a Presidential proclamation seals his Puerto Rican deal, I suggest that Mr. Udall be asked to come up with some convincing answers to a number of questions:

First. If the White House is planning to issue a new proclamation on oil imports, what reassurance can Mr. Udall give us concerning continuing restriction of residual oil imports into the United States?

Second. In view of the fact that the Johnson administration has asked American corporations to reduce by 15 to 20 percent their net flow of dollars out of this country, will this new increment of foreign imports through Puerto Rico help or aggravate the balance-of-payments problem and the gold-flow position?

Third. What specific products are to be produced, and in what quantities, by the proposed Puerto Rican chemical plants?

Fourth. Where will the products produced in this new complex be marketed?

Fifth. What quantities of what specific products will be dumped in the U.S. market?

Sixth. What is the specific position in the U.S. market—shortage or depressed surplus situation—of each product to be produced in the Puerto Rico complex?

Seventh. Will anything be done, as a counter to the Puerto Rican project, to plug existing loopholes, such as the northern tier situation?

Eighth. How does Mr. Udall propose to arrange this Puerto Rican deal, "consistent with the basic objectives of the mandatory oil import control program," as stated in his press release of February 11, 1965?

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of Mr. Udall's February 11 press release and several pertinent news accounts.

There being no objection, the release and the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U.S. Department of the Interior, Feb. 11, 1965]

#### DECISION ANNOUNCED TO ESTABLISH PETRO-CHEMICAL INDUSTRY IN PUERTO RICO

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall today announced his decision to take action under the oil import control program to encourage a huge petrochemical complex to be established in Puerto Rico.

Secretary Udall has determined that the establishment of a petrochemical industry on the island deriving its feedstocks from the Caribbean would not be inconsistent with the objectives of the oil import program. This determination was based on a careful study in the Department and on an examination of the record of a hearing on the matter of a proposal for the establishment of a petrochemical complex conducted by the Oil Import Administration on July 31, 1964.

Secretary Udall made the announcement in the presence of Commonwealth Governor Roberto Sanchez Vilella following a discussion of the basic economic situation in Puerto Rico.

Secretary Udall said that economic progress in Puerto Rico has been remarkable as a result of Operation Bootstrap conducted by the government of the Commonwealth. It is evident, however, that unless there is a fundamental shift in the nature of the economic development of Puerto Rico to the establishment of basic industries that are capable of affording greatly increased opportunities for stable employment on the island, the Commonwealth will face serious economic difficulties and mounting unemployment in the relatively near future.

In recognition of the difficulties confronting the island, Secretary Udall pointed out, officials of the Commonwealth have concluded, after extensive planning and research, that one of the most attractive possibilities from the standpoint of potential employment would be the establishment in Puerto Rico of the nucleus of a petrochemical industry. The existence of such a nucleus would make feasible the establishment of a broad range of satellite operations capable of utilizing a large labor force in the manufacture of products, including consumer goods, from petrochemicals.

Today's announcement clears the way for the initiation of active negotiations leading to the establishment of a petrochemical nucleus.

In carrying out the decision Secretary Udall indicated initial consideration would be given by Department officials to a highly promising proposal by the Phillips Petroleum Co.

Phillips has made a concrete offer to the Commonwealth government and to the Department of the Interior for the establishment of a petrochemical core facility. The Oil Import Administration has given careful consideration to this offer and last July conducted a public hearing on the matter. In light of the importance of developing basic industry in Puerto Rico, the Department will enter final negotiations with Phillips to ascertain whether a plan can be developed which will insure the building of a major petrochemical complex that will involve maximum economic benefits and maximum employment opportunities for Puerto Rico. In conducting these negotiations it was indicated that Interior intended to work closely with, and look for general guidance to, the Governor of Puerto Rico in making any final decisions concerning the Phillips Petroleum proposal.

If satisfactory arrangements can be made, it would be the Department's intention to allow petroleum import allocations to the successful applicant sufficient to provide feedstocks for the proposed complex. Any arrangements made, in addition to providing a stimulus to the Puerto Rican economy, would be consistent with the basic objectives of the mandatory oil import control program.

[From the Oil and Gas Journal, Feb. 22, 1965]

#### WATCHING WASHINGTON: WILL PRODUCT IMPORTS FROM PUERTO RICO BE RESTRICTED?

(By Gene T. Kinney)

Pressure is being revived to place Puerto Rico under a quota system to control imports from the Commonwealth to the U.S. east coast.

It arises from Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall's approval of Phillips Petroleum Co.'s plans to build a petrochemical plant there and ship byproduct gasoline to the United States.

Udall has approved in principle the quota of 50,000 barrels a day in unfinished oils for the plant, as well as the shipment of gasoline to the United States. He is negotiating with Phillips to minimize the gasoline volume, which the company has estimated would range up to 24,800 barrels a day.

The Interior Secretary is assuring the domestic industry that the gasoline imports won't boost the U.S. total. They are to be accommodated somehow without raising nonresidual imports into district 1-4 above the 12.2 percent ratio to domestic production.

Just how it will be worked out has not been decided, Udall indicates. Anything he does will be an exception to present regulations which will have to be changed accordingly.

Will other importers have to move over to make room for Phillips' increase? Will Phillips have to use any of its 21,100-barrels-a-day existing quota for this purpose?

The Independent Petroleum Association of America is pressing Udall for a specific answer. So is the Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association. TIPRO raises again the issue of foreign-source products which enter the United States from Puerto Rico outside the mandatory controls program.

Udall's assurances of holding the line on total imports are placating neither domestic producers nor refiners. They complain of circumvention of the program and unfair competition from a significant increase in foreign products in an already oversupplied east coast market.

When mandatory controls were imposed in

1959, regulations were drawn to freeze light products shipments from Puerto Rico to the mainland at 1958 levels. This was done by the indirect method of controlling crude allocations.

The two Puerto Rican refiners are allowed to import enough crude to meet local and export demand, and to continue the 33,000 barrels a day of light products shipments to the United States that were being made when controls were imposed.

If the full Phillips plant output were added to this, gasoline and distillate imports from the island would almost double.

This arrangement, TIPRO charges, rewards the Puerto Rican economy and importing companies at the expense of domestic producers.

U.S. refiners maintain that the deal violates the arrangement made in lieu of a proposed quota system for products from Puerto Rico. It therefore again raises the question of restricting Puerto Rican shipments which the Commonwealth successfully resisted 6 years ago.

Some sources suggest a quota system on imports from Puerto Rico as a substitute for controls on imports into the island.

While its legal status would be uncertain, advocates of the plan say shifting the point of control would solve two problems.

It would open up the island to competing refiners and petrochemical companies to serve local and foreign markets from plants to be built there. At the same time, it would close what many consider to be a loophole in the imports program.

[From the Oil Daily, Feb. 22, 1965]

#### UDALL ASSURES IPAA ON IMPORTS FROM PUERTO RICO

WASHINGTON.—Interior Secretary Udall has assured the Independent Petroleum Association of America that any oil product shipments from Puerto Rico to the U.S. mainland, resulting from the proposed petrochemical complex to be built by Phillips Petroleum Co. will not result in any "net increase" in imports to the United States under import controls set by the Government.

Minor Jameson, Jr., executive vice president of the IPAA, said that "the intent is clear—any increase in shipments from Puerto Rico to the United States will be deducted from the controlled import level set by the Interior Department, either products or crude oil. We oppose any product imports, but if these are continued then it would seem any shipments by Phillips from Puerto Rico would force other importers to 'move over'."

Interior Secretary Udall wrote H. A. True, Jr., IPAA president, that if "establishment of such a complex results in increased shipments of gasoline or other petroleum products into the United States, we can assure you that it would be our intention to seek adjustments of the program to insure that net receipts in the United States of petroleum products from foreign areas would not be increased as a result of such shipments."

[From the Oil Daily, Feb. 17, 1965]

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT SEEKS TO CLARIFY POINT IN PHILLIPS COMPLEX OK

WASHINGTON.—Top officials at the Interior Department are now trying to clarify one point Interior Secretary Udall believes may not have received enough emphasis in reports dealing with his tentative approval of the Phillips Petroleum Co. plans to build a massive petrochemical complex in Puerto Rico.

They said that Udall wants to make it clear that if the Government permits Phillips to import byproduct gasoline from Puerto Rico to the east coast mainland, this import will be covered in the level of imports which is set to control the flow of crude unfinished oils and finished products into districts I-IV.



said in a speech that bar associations throughout the country and other special interest groups had "declared open season on the press."

#### A CHANGE IN SCOPE

An analysis of the press coverage of last week's biggest arrest story—the alleged plot by four conspirators to dynamite the Statue of Liberty and other national monuments—shows that the proposed codes would drastically change the present scope of coverage, if they are ever enforced.

Under the New Jersey Supreme Court code and the proposed Pennsylvania code, two vital aspects of the dynamite story could not have been released to the press.

One was the long statement by Police Commissioner Michael J. Murphy, quoting alleged admissions by the plotters to the police undercover man who exposed the plot. The statements included colorful details of how the defendants allegedly hoped to blow the arm and the head off the Statue of Liberty, and also the explanation that they were motivated by a desire "to dramatize the plight of the Negro."

The codes would also have prohibited the disclosure by the police of prior arrests of three of the alleged conspirators.

If the arrests had occurred in States where such codes were in effect, the police officers could have told only the details of the arrests, and the identity and photographs of the accused, their residences descriptions and family status.

However, the fact that the dynamite story was reported in full in the New Jersey newspapers illustrated the difficulty of limiting press coverage under American law.

The U.S. Supreme Court held in 1941 that a judge cannot punish a journalist for contempt for commenting about a pending trial unless there is a "clear and present danger" of obstructing justice.

This is in sharp contrast to the British practice, where judges impose harsh fines and prison sentences on journalists who print details about accused persons prior to their trials.

But even if the dynamite suspects had been arrested in New Jersey, the judges could not have enforced their rules against the police officials, since their code says such violations should be punished by superior officers.

Thus the court-imposed bans can be enforced only against lawyers subject to the judges' discipline, and even this control is subject to "leaks."

In recent years the courts have demonstrated a growing tendency to declare mistrials when they feel the news media has prejudiced the public against a defendant.

Dr. Sam Sheppard was released from Ohio State penitentiary, after serving 10 years of a life term for the murder of his wife, in part because a Federal district judge felt his case had been prejudiced by unfair newspaper publicity.

Mistrials have been declared in recent months in Nevada and Rhode Island because the trial judges felt the defendant's chances for a fair trial had been prejudiced by newspaper publicity.

#### EDITOR IS CRITICAL

Police officers have criticized the proposed press bans on the grounds that the public should be informed when a dangerous criminal who has been terrorizing a community has finally been caught.

Felix E. McKnight, executive vice president and editor of the Dallas Times Herald, recently said in a speech to the Oklahoma Press Association:

"More and more protective measures are asked for the accused criminal, and fewer and fewer freedoms for the press to publicly unmask these degenerates who rob, rape, murder, and intimidate the citizens of this country."

Many representatives of the communications industry have said there is a real need to protect the rights of defendants, and in Massachusetts and Oregon the press and bar have adopted joint guides for their relationship.

On the national level the American Newspaper Publishers Association organized a Committee on Free Press and Fair Trial last week, the Associated Press Managing Editors Association has a committee working on the problem, and the American Society of Newspaper Editors is urging all branches of the news media to study the matter.

The American Bar Association has a parallel committee working on a 3-year study under the chairmanship of Justice Paul C. Reardon of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts.

#### THE PRESIDENT NEEDS OUR SUPPORT AS VIETNAM POLICY UNFOLDS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Mr. George Bundy recently said, "Wars always end in negotiation."

No doubt the present war in Vietnam will also end in this way. Already, preliminary probings have been undertaken by allies, neutrals, and trusted third parties. Once again the Secretary General of the United Nations is demonstrating his skill and his great usefulness by his responsible services as a reliable go-between.

I am not dismayed by this turn of events, Mr. President; I welcome it. I welcome negotiations, not because I believe the United States should or could pull out from its commitment in South Vietnam, but because I believe this commitment lacks purpose, sense, and direction unless we are willing to work on all fronts, diplomatic as well as military, in our efforts to stabilize the area. "War is but a political instrument," said Von Clausewitz, and Churchill added, "We arm to parley."

We arm and we war for nothing if we refuse to parley. Most certainly this is true in southeast Asia, where our unquestioned superiority in the air and on the sea makes it impossible for other nations to ignore the might of our commitment, while at the same time Red China's strength on the ground and her geographical proximity make her inevitably a part of any equation for the stabilization of southeast Asia.

I do not fear our parley on the settlement of the war in Vietnam. In recent weeks, we have more than demonstrated our determination and our power to insure that South Vietnam will not be engulfed by her neighbor to the north. We have made clear to all concerned that we have the capability and, if need be, the will to level the north, to preserve the integrity of the south. We shall not be speaking from weakness when we go to the conference table. It will be no Munich, no appeasement, no surrender.

Last, and most important, I have no fear of parley, because we have, in the person of our President, one as skilled as any in recent history in the power of persuasion and the art of negotiation. His surpassing talents in understanding men, their motivation, and their feelings will

serve us well as the United States undertakes discussions at whatever level.

Our Nation would go to the conference table with a strong hand and a skilled player.

Mr. President, of course, we cannot know now just what is underway in international channels. We do know that the British, the French, the Indians, the Russians, and the Secretary General are participating in a search for a mutually acceptable basis from which negotiations might proceed. We do know that Ho Chi Minh has repeatedly sought such negotiations. And we do know that the President has informed our allies that the United States has no stated objections to their interest and that "we have naturally given them a full account of the situation and our views." Well and good, Mr. President; well and good.

I believe it is important for Senators to give the President the support he needs as these delicate and critical events unfold. He must have the flexibility and the freedom of action he needs at this juncture—a flexibility and a freedom which our confidence and our support can supply.

I ask unanimous support that three articles dealing with these matters be made a part of the Record at this point. The first, by Drew Middleton, is from the New York Times; the second, by Murray Marder, is from the Washington Post; and the third, by Thomas Hamilton, is also from the New York Times.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

HANOI SAID TO ASK FRANCE TO PRESS UNITED STATES TO NEGOTIATE—HO CHI MINH IS REPORTED EAGER FOR GENEVA TALKS ON VIETNAM SETTLEMENT—DE GAULLE EFFORT SEEN—MEDIATION ROLE SUGGESTED—WASHINGTON REJECTS IDEA OF NEW CONFERENCE NOW

(By Drew Middleton)

PARIS, February 22—North Vietnam recently urged France to intensify her efforts for a negotiated settlement of the war in South Vietnam, a reliable French source said today.

The appeal was made during the present crisis and was related to President de Gaulle's last call, on February 10, for the reconvening of the Geneva Conference to negotiate a peace, the source said.

He did not link the North Vietnamese move directly to the U.S. air strikes on targets in North Vietnam. Inquiries tonight failed to elicit either confirmation or denial of the connection.

He emphasized, however, that the government of Ho Chi Minh had proposed that, in view of France's known support of a negotiated peace, General De Gaulle's government take a more active role in calling a conference.

#### SUPPORT FOR MOVE HINTED

The French have interpreted this suggestion as a hint that North Vietnam would support France if she proposed a date for the reconvening of the Conference and would attend the meeting.

(In Washington, officials said that they had refused to give the French a mandate as mediators and that they were not interested now in reconvening the Conference.)

The North Vietnamese have used the French mission in Hanoi, headed by Jacques

de Buzon, for overtures to the United States before the one disclosed today.

Diplomatic sources have reported Foreign Minister Maurice Couve de Murville as having said, as early as last December, that President Ho Chi Minh had told France that he wanted to discuss the basis for an accommodation with the United States either directly and privately or through a third party, presumably France.

An even earlier indication of President Ho Chi Minh's desire to negotiate developed at the first meeting between President Johnson and U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations, after the assassination of President Kennedy.

At that encounter, according to diplomatic sources, Mr. Thant gave Mr. Johnson a message from the North Vietnamese President suggesting talks on a settlement.

The French source who disclosed the latest approach said France had told President Ho Chi Minh she did not wish to do anything to embarrass the United States at this critical juncture.

The French Government, allied diplomats said, appeared to be playing a rather involved role in the crisis.

The French source said the Government believed China and North Vietnam would be responsive to proposals for a conference that would discuss the future of southeast Asia and of the United Nations.

Allied diplomats here are convinced that General de Gaulle's government is trying to elbow its way into a central position as mediator between the United States and the two Asian powers.

This French effort is being made despite the continuing opposition of the administration in Washington to either a conference or negotiations carried out directly or through a third power.

France's insistence that China participate in a negotiated settlement on the future of southeast Asia has developed some new aspects.

According to this source, China would probably accept and France would be amenable to a conference that discussed both southeast Asia and the future organization of the United Nations.

General de Gaulle proposed a meeting of the major powers, including China, on the future of the United Nations on February 4. Six days later the French Cabinet renewed its appeal for a meeting of the Geneva Conference as the forum for a negotiated settlement in South Vietnam.

#### PEIPING CONCESSION SEEN

The French apparently are convinced that, despite Chinese demands that the United States withdraw from southeast Asia as a condition for a meeting, Peiping would accept a conference with American troops still in South Vietnam.

The Chinese, however, have not offered any warm, public diplomatic support for French initiatives on a conference.

The source's estimate of the course of events in southeast Asia after a negotiated settlement apparently reflects President de Gaulle's long-term thinking.

It is taken for granted here that the United States would leave South Vietnam and Laos as a consequence of any settlement and that this would leave France the dominant Western Power in the area because of economic and cultural ties left over from the colonial era.

This, however, would be a transitory period. The French expect the advent of "revolutionary authoritarian socialism" throughout southeast Asia, the source said.

The impression given by this source was that the French want to expand their role as mediator in the southeast Asia crisis. Mr. Couve de Murville, they expect, will transmit the views of President Johnson and

Secretary of State Rusk to the Chinese Ambassador here on his return from the United States.

#### U.S. BARS A MANDATE

WASHINGTON, February 22.—In his talks here this week with President Johnson and other officials, Foreign Minister Couve de Murville said the French Government had reason to believe that North Vietnam and Communist China would agree to negotiations called without conditions.

French officials did not disclose the basis of this belief and U.S. officials said they had not been told of any specific Communist overtures. They said they had refused to give the French a mandate as mediators in the Vietnam situation and were not interested at this time in a return to the conference table.

[From the Washington Post]

#### STILL ADHERES TO ITS RIGHT TO HIT BACK (By Murrey Marder)

Confirmation came yesterday that the United States wants a door kept open for possible negotiations on the Vietnamese crisis, without relinquishing the American option to strike again at North Vietnam.

British Prime Minister Harold Wilson said his nation now is "actively engaged in diplomatic consultations of a confidential nature," to seek a basis for "peaceful settlement" of the Vietnamese conflict. The State Department confirmed discussions with Britain on Vietnam, but avoided characterizing their purpose. Britain in fact is engaged in probing talks with the Soviet Union.

In Paris, Soviet Ambassador Sergei Vinogradov had a 20-minute meeting with President De Gaulle. A French official said at a diplomatic reception afterward: "The Soviet Union wants to put us in her game in the preparation of a possible conference on Vietnam."

These events came against a background of other diplomatic reports which, cumulatively, raised speculation that the crisis now may be clearly headed toward negotiations.

But informed sources here hold this is an ironic case in which there is considerably less diplomatic motion below the surface than there appears to be from the seeming activity on the surface. Even the most negotiation-minded sources agree that there is nothing yet in sight that begins to form a basis for negotiations.

Britain, it was earned, is conducting more talks with the Soviet Union in Moscow to determine if the Russians would be interested in reviving the British-Soviet cochairmanship of the 1954 Geneva Conference on Indochina, North and South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

At present the Soviet Union acknowledges that it has a cochairman role only for Laos, which was the special subject of a 1961-62 conference designed to reinforce that nation's neutrality.

#### DOUBTS ON SOVIET COURSE

If the Soviet Union were now to indicate interest in asserting a cochairmanship role for all former French Indochina, that would indicate a willingness to serve in some mediating capacity in the Vietnamese crisis.

Even if the Soviet Union demonstrates interest in such a course, that would be several steps removed from any actual negotiation.

Some diplomatic sources are especially doubtful that the Soviet Union wants to make such a decision now, because of the international Communist conference scheduled in Moscow for Monday.

That meeting originally was called to prepare for a Communist world conference, which many thought might bring a showdown in the world ideological rivalry between Russia and Communist China. But the Vietnamese conflict has tended to create some

greater degree of Sino-Soviet common interest. It is for this reason that the Soviets may be especially reluctant now to be cast in any mediating role over Vietnam.

The United States will get a direct opportunity today to take its own soundings with Communist China on the Vietnamese crisis.

John M. Cabot, U.S. Ambassador to Poland, is due to meet in Warsaw with Chinese Communist Ambassador Wang Kuo-chuan.

While the United States and Communist China do not have official diplomatic relations, the Warsaw talks will be the 126th meeting that the two nations have held intermittently for diplomatic contacts since the collapse of French power in Indochina in 1954.

Since the United States and South Vietnamese retaliatory air strikes against North Vietnam, Red China has warned the United States that it is risking a repetition in Vietnam of the Chinese military intercession in the Korean war. China publicly has been goading the Soviet Union to hold a firm line in support of North Vietnam.

#### U.S. STATEMENT

American officials again avoided any substantive comment on either the Vietnam crisis or the diplomatic maneuvers. All that was said here in response to questions about Prime Minister Wilson's remarks in the House of Commons was the following cryptic statement by State Department Press Officer Robert J. McCloskey:

"The British and other governments have been in touch with us with respect to our attitude on South Vietnam, and we have naturally given them a full account of the situation and our views."

That phrasing officially enabled the United States to continue avoiding any public hint of interest in possible negotiations on the Vietnam crisis. The Johnson administration is continuing its policy of publicly avoiding that issue entirely, so that it can, if it deems it necessary, repeat its efforts to apply pressure on North Vietnam by air strikes or other retaliatory measures.

The carefully drawn statements yesterday in London and Washington allowed each nation to serve its own interests. The British statement enabled Wilson to create the impression that a good deal was underway in secret confidential talks, particularly to soothe the leftwing of his British Labor Party. The United States, in turn, sought to create the impression that it was holding itself at arm's length from British diplomatic probing of the Soviets.

Reports from Paris during the previous 2 days, stating that North Vietnam recently urged France to settle the crisis, were strongly denied again here by several sources, including French diplomatic sources. French Foreign Minister Maurice Couve de Murville, in urging negotiations in his talks here last week, did not contend that North Vietnam was soliciting them, all sources here agreed.

#### SOVIET VERSION GIVEN

After Soviet Ambassador Vinogradov's call on President de Gaulle yesterday, Soviet sources in Paris were quoted as saying that he left a memorandum summarizing what he told De Gaulle. The sources said the message "underlined the gravity of the present situation" in Vietnam, "especially the American bombing of North Vietnam."

[From the New York Times]

THANT ASKS VIETNAM TALKS LEADING TO A U.S. PULLOUT—U.N. CHIEF REPORTS HE HAS OFFERED SOME PROPOSALS—SAYS THAT IF AMERICANS HAD FACTS THEY WOULD BACK HIM

(By Thomas J. Hamilton)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., February 24.—The Secretary General, U Thant, advocated today informal negotiations for the establishment

United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 111

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1965

No. 37

## Senate

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, very great, yet very near—nearer than breathing, nearer than hands or feet: Wherever goodness is, or truth or beauty, there Thou art.

We thank Thee for human love, which at its purest and best bears witness to Thee, and evermore keeps faith and hope alive in the world.

With all our imperfections and fallible judgments, grant unto us a compassion for others, whatever their need—a sympathy which understands and pities and forgives.

Undergird us, we pray, with the vision splendid of eternal values which have supported the valiant who were seeking ends too great to be reached in their own lifetimes.

In a confused world where we see the dreadful penalties of selfish human separations, dedicate us anew as we strive to serve this anguished generation, as builders of bridges across all the dividing gulfs which mar and rend this sadly severed earth.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 24, 1965, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were

referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

### LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements made during the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Upon request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Judiciary Committee and the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

### CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, through an inadvertent reporting error Wednesday, February 24, during the colloquy the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] and I were having concerning the Vietnam policy of the United States, a very considerable statement by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] appearing on page 3438 is attributed to me.

Obviously such attribution is highly confusing to the reader since I appear to assume a position directly in opposition to that which I hold. Therefore, I wish the Record to show that my remarks in column 1, page 3438, are contained in the single paragraph which reads:

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator from Wyoming makes reference to the interesting question concerning negotiation. Why not negotiate now? When we sit down to negotiate, we sit down to try to make some reasonable, rational adjustment in an area where there are honest differences of opinion.

The response of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] immediately follows, beginning with his

statement in the final paragraph of column 1, page 3438, which is: "We have no indication that anyone wishes to sit down on the other side," and continuing through the second column and concluding in the runover paragraph at the top of column 3 which ends with the sentence "Once we clear the air on that point, we shall be in a position to sit down and talk realistically about some kind of settlement of the issues that have generated unrest in this area."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The correction will be made.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### PAYMENT OF INCENTIVE PAY FOR SUBMARINE DUTY

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of incentive pay for submarine duty to personnel qualified in submarines attached to staffs of submarine operational commanders (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, for the fourth quarter of 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 12 of the Natural Gas Act with respect to the issuance of securities for the construction, acquisition or operation of pipeline facilities (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Natural Gas Act to authorize the Federal Power Commission to prescribe safety requirements for natural gas companies (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting

3456

a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Natural Gas Act to require a certificate of public convenience and necessity for the acquisition of a controlling interest, through the ownership of securities or in any other manner, of any person engaged in the transportation of natural gas, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subsection 14(a) of the Natural Gas Act to provide the Commission with broad authority to gather information concerning the operations of the natural gas industry, and to publish and disseminate appropriate information thereon for the benefit of consumers, interested agencies, and the industry itself (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2(7) of the Natural Gas Act to enlarge the definition of "interstate commerce" to include commerce across the international boundaries of the country (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

#### APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that Commissioners of the Federal Maritime Commission shall hereafter be appointed for a term of 5 years, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

#### PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the rental of quarters by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for subsistence supplies for severely handicapped children in schools or classes established for their benefit in the public schools of the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of financial statements, fiscal year 1964, Veterans' Canteen Service, Veterans' Administration, dated February 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on savings to be realized by encouraging private physicians to permit Veterans' Administration pharmacies to fill prescriptions with less expensive, generically equivalent drugs, Veterans' Administration, dated February 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary procurement of shipping containers and packaging materials for 2.75-inch rockets, Department of the Navy, dated February 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred

in the procurement of reusable metal containers for the Bulbup missile, Department of the Navy, dated February 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

#### AMENDMENT OF CHAPTER XI OF BANKRUPTCY ACT

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend chapter XI of the Bankruptcy Act to give the court supervisory power over all fees paid from whatever source (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT TO PERMIT A HUSBAND AND WIFE TO FILE A JOINT PETITION

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Bankruptcy Act to permit a husband and wife to file a joint petition in ordinary bankruptcy and chapter XIII (wage earner) proceedings (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD AND NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, together with a report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

#### REPORT ON POSITIONS IN GRADES GS-16, GS-17, AND GS-18

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Manpower, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, for the calendar year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### REPORT ON STATUS OF CONSTRUCTION, ALTERATION, OR ACQUISITION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the status of construction, alteration, or acquisition of public buildings, dated December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

#### "CHAPTER —

"Senate Joint Resolution 3—Relative to legislative apportionment

"Whereas the U.S. Supreme Court has held that both houses of a bicameral State legislature must be apportioned on the basis of population; and

"Whereas it will now be totally impossible to apportion representation to reflect the diverse and conflicting interests within a State; and

"Whereas California's present apportionment unduly deprives urban areas of adequate representation in the State senate, nevertheless the Court's decision will enable heavily populated areas to dominate State legislatures, and will lead to a virtual loss of representation in all other areas of the State; and

"Whereas in order to prevent this complete disruption of the legislative process in the States, and to preserve for each State the

right to balance its representation in the manner best suited to its individual situation, it is essential that the Constitution of the United States be amended to enable the State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That they respectfully request the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in accordance with the provisions of article V thereof, to add an article providing that:

#### "ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Nothing in the Constitution of the United States shall prohibit any State, which has a bicameral legislature, from apportioning the membership of one house of its legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment be submitted to a vote of all of the people of the State at an election in which the franchise is not denied on the basis of race, creed, or color and resubmitted to a vote of all of the people of the State, prior to the implementation of the apportionment plan, and at regular intervals not to exceed 10 years."

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution adopted by the Daughters of Isabella, Holy Family Circle No. 824, Carver County, Minn., favoring price support programs for basic commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The petition of E. L. Decker, of Sun City, Ariz., praying for the enactment of S. 1, to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Milbrae, Calif., favoring the adoption of a constitutional amendment relating to reapportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], I send to the desk a concurrent resolution adopted by the South Carolina State Legislature memorializing Congress to protest the proposed drastic reduction in technical assistance to soil conservation districts. I ask that this resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO PROTEST THE PROPOSED DRASTIC REDUCTION IN TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Whereas the budget proposal of President Lyndon B. Johnson provides for a reduction of \$20 million in funds to USDA Soil Conservation Service for the provision of technical assistance to landowners in the application of the soil conservation district program; and

Whereas this proposal also embraces a change in the traditional method of financing the cost of technical assistance through soil conservation districts to landowners